DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 381 029 FL 022 889

AUTHOR	Evans, Carol A., Ed.
TITLE	Scholar with a Mission: The Career of Theodore Andersson and His Contributions to Language Education.
INSTITUTION	National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education, Washington, DC.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Languages Affairs (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE	Feb 93
CONTRACT	T292008001
NOTE	89p.; Papers originally presented at the Annual Conference of the National Association of Bilingual Education (Los Angeles, CA, 1994).
PUB TYPE	Collected Works - General (020) -- Historical Materials (060) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Bilingual Education; Bilingualism; *Cultural Maintenance; Dialects; Early Childhood Education; Educational Innovation; Ethnic Bias; *FLES; Higher Education; *Intercultural Communication; Language Attitudes; *Language Proficiency; Mexican Americans; Minority Groups; Multicultural Education; Preschool Children; *Second Language Instruction; *Second Language Learning; Spanish Speaking; Teacher Education; Teacher Qualifications; Teaching Methods; Young Children
IDENTIFIERS	*Andersson (Theodore); Modern Language Association; Two Way Bilingual Education

ABSTRACT

The accomplishments of Theodore "Tug" Andersson (1903-1994) cover four major areas: (1) the teaching of modern languages in general; (2) the foreign languages in the elementary school (FLES) in particular; (3) bilingual education in the United States; and (4) preschool biliteracy. The 11 articles of Andersson's work are as follows: (1) "FLES after Fifty: The Bilingual Legacy of Theodore Andersson" (William F. Mackey); (2) "Some Early Encounters" (Joshua A. Fishman); (3) "Yet Another Tribute" (Wallace Lambert); (4) "A Very Sane Man of La Mancha" (Robert Lado); (5) "Pioneer, Visionary, Educator" (George M. Blanco); (6) "An Intellectual Foundation for Bilingual Education" (Eugene Garcia); (7) "Scholarship, Geniality, and a Sense of Fun" (Muriel Saville-Troike and Rudy Troike); (8) "A Man with a Clear Vision of the Big Picture" (Chester C. Christian, Jr.); (9) "A Student's Perspective" (Carol A. Evans); (10) "Communication in Interaction: A Total Approach" (Ragnhild Soderbergh); and (11) "Challenging Language Prospects: A View of the Scholarly Work" (Carol A. Evans). A biographical sketch is included. (Contains 78 references.) (LR)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 381 029

Scholar with a Mission: The Career of Theodore Andersson and his Contributions to Language Education

Carol A. Evans
Editor

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Joel Gomez

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

FL022889

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

NCBE
The National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education

The National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education (NCBE) is funded by the U.S. Department of Education's Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Languages Affairs (OBEMLA) and is operated under Contract No. T292008001 by The George Washington University, Center for Policy Studies, Graduate School of Education and Human Development. The contents of this publication do not necessarily reflect the views or policies of the Department of Education, nor does the mention of trade names, commercial products, or organizations imply endorsement by the U.S. Government. Readers are free to duplicate or use these materials in keeping with accepted publication standards. NCBE requests that proper credit be given in the event of reproduction.

This document is an NCBE resource collection reproduction.

February 1995

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Scholar with a Mission: The Career of Theodore Andersson and his Contributions to Language Education

Carol A. Evans
Editor

NCBE
The National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education

Table of Contents

Foreword iii
Carol A. Evans

A Biographical Sketch v

FLES After Fifty: The Bilingual Legacy of Theodore Andersson 1
William F. Mackey

Some Early Encounters 5
Joshua A. Fishman

Yet Another Tribute 9
Wallace Lambert

A Very Sane Man of la Mancha 13
Robert Lado

Pioneer, Visionary, Educator 15
George M. Blanco

An Intellectual Foundation for Bilingual Education 21
Eugene García

Scholarhip, Geniality, and a Sense of Fun 23
Muriel Saville-Troike and Rudy Troike

A Man with a Clear Vision of the Big Picture 25
Chester C. Christian, Jr.

A Student's Perspective 29
Carol A. Evans

Communication in Interaction: A Total Approach 33
Ragnhild Söderbergh

Challenging Language Prospects: A View of the Scholarly Work 49
Carol A. Evans

Foreword

This book originated in a set of presentations given at the 1994 Annual Conference of the National Association of Bilingual Education in Los Angeles. The session was conceived of by Timothy D'Emilio, Educational Research Analyst in the Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Language Affairs. Friend and longtime admirer of Theodore Andersson's work in bilingual education and in preschool literacy, Tim got the ball rolling and then called me to suggest that we team forces on the project. I was delighted.

We began by making a list of people who, taken together, might cover the many facets of this long and varied career in language education. In spite of the short timeframe, the friends and colleagues we called responded graciously and enthusiastically, in many cases already seeming to have their thoughts about Tug's work on the tips of their tongues. Our contributors were too polite to say so directly, but it was clear that they needed no coaching about how to recall the character and significance of Tug's contributions.

The result was a remarkable set of brief, highly personal reflections, rich in historical fact about the very *human* beginnings of the language movements since the middle of this century. With the exception of some brief salutory lines sent by A. Bruce Gaarder, all formal presentations from the conference appear in this volume. William F. Mackey and Ragnhild Söderbergh, both precluded from contributing to the session by our short notice and their distance from the L.A. conference, have each written papers since. The latter paper differs from the rest of the collection in being more typical of a piece appearing in a festschrift. Nevertheless, Söderbergh's remarkable latest work in studying her granddaughter's oral and written language acquisition fits this volume quite nicely. It constitutes a fresh and important contribution in preschool literacy, an area to which Tug Andersson devoted many of his last 20 years.

In the final paper, I have attempted to draw together key aspects of Tug's work since 1950, focusing on several ideas which seem paramount, and their relation to the four major areas of effort in this part of his career: the teaching of modern languages in general, foreign languages in the elementary school in particular, bilingual education, and preschool biliteracy. In this view of his scholarly work as in the reflections of the other contributors, we are reminded that the language innovations in question began not in institutions, but in the bold and imaginative efforts of individuals. In the words of Bill Mackey, "it takes people of vision to point the direction, initiate changes, and incite slow-moving bureaucracies to action."

One omission from this collection requires special note. Mildred Boyer, Tug's longtime friend and collaborator, was unable to offer a prepared statement of her own. She wished the project well, however, and noted that the NABE presentation would coincide almost perfectly with Tug's 91st birthday. We sent copies of the presentations after the conference, and she read them with Tug, who was delighted and touched. Unfortunately, Tug did not live to see the book in finished form. He died on July 28th.

Many people have helped in this endeavor. At the Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Language Affairs, in addition to Tim D'Emilio's stalwart and continuing assistance, both Eugene García and Gil García lent a hand at key moments. Thanks, too, to Nancy Zelasko at the National Association for Bilingual Education for accommodating a late request for a conference slot. The College of Education at the University of Arizona provided funds for videotaping the Troikes; in this connection, thanks also to Dean John Taylor, Dan Kirby, Richard

Ruiz, and Dave Betts for a variety of forms of support ranging from money to advice to technical assistance. We are particularly grateful to Roberto Medrano who videotaped the NABE session and kindly shared his tape with us. Also, special thanks to Choco Leandro, Andréa Greimel and Robert Milk, friends of Tug's who stood in and read papers for the several contributors unable to present at the session themselves. Joel Gómez, Director of the National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education, and also a former student of Tug's, has taken a special interest in this project, for which we are grateful. Many thanks, too, to Carol Groseth for her intelligent, patient, and skillful assistance in retyping the book. Finally, special thanks to Joseph Shoben, who lent invaluable encouragement and counsel throughout this endeavor.

I was one of the many who, hearing the papers at the NABE session was struck again and again by new revelations of Tug's quietly intrepid workings in all sectors related to language education. That even those close to him would experience his being honored as a stream of new discoveries about his work is explained in part by his self-effacing nature; even if asked directly about some accomplishment, he tended to escape the matter by teasing the questioner or making some vague statement about enjoying good luck. In fact, as Andréa Greimel pointed out, the collected reflections about Tug also revealed an almost troll-like quality of the honoree, as contributor after contributor, noting some key event, was still musing years later, "I wonder if Tug was behind that, too."

It is my hope that other friends, students, and colleagues may similarly discover here fresh and useful revelations of the qualities and work of a man they have already admired. Perhaps a more important tribute, however, is the fact that the effects of Tug's work will continue to touch the lives of many children, parents, teachers, and others who will never know him personally. For these readers, too, we hope it will be possible to enjoy what he accomplished, and also to glimpse the challenge he has left in our hands.

C.A.E

A Biographical Sketch of Theodore Andersson's Professional Life

In addition to the typical biographical chronology, the information here includes some notes which allow a glimpse of Theodore Andersson's own language learning. His language learning experiences constitute a personal background for some of the trademark themes of his work: the intrinsic value of learning languages, the value of *early* language learning, the importance of acquiring languages in their own cultural setting, and the preferability of language teachers who teach their native language. They merit a bit of elaboration.

Until age six, Tug was essentially a monolingual child of bilingual parents. He was born in New Haven, Connecticut, to Swedish American parents, each of whom, at age 17, had caught "America fever" and emigrated alone from Sweden. They spoke mostly English to their son, though he also understood when they spoke Swedish. The experience that Tug would later call his most important in preparation as a language teacher took place when Tug was four. When his father lost his job in the depression of 1907, Tug and his mother went to live with her family in Sweden until his father could find steady work. This immersion into Swedish resembled a first language acquisition experience in the depth of its effect on Tug, and in fact, caused him to "forget" English. After two years he and his mother returned to New Haven in time for him to begin attending first grade. Within weeks he was speaking English again, maintaining and developing Swedish to an extent through participation at a local Swedish Methodist Church. As an adult he returned to Sweden often, both to travel and to visit family and friends.

As an undergraduate at Yale he seized the opportunity to formalize his knowledge of Swedish, but also widely broadened his linguistic scope, studying four other languages as well. As a doctoral student a few years later, his knowledge of French won him a graduate student teaching assistantship. He himself was not satisfied with his proficiency, however, and he borrowed ahead on his salary and sailed to Paris for a "soaking" in French. Through this and many other extended experiences in France, he became, as Wally Lambert notes in this volume, an excellent French speaker. Over his lifetime, he gradually deepened his command of Spanish in similar fashion, seeking opportunities to travel and work in Spanish-speaking countries.

1903	Born in New Haven, Connecticut
1907-1909	Lived in rural Sweden (Dalarna) with his mother and her family
1909	Reunited with both parents in New Haven
1925	B.A. Yale: Spanish, French, Italian, Swedish, Latin
1926	M.A. Yale: Spanish
1927	Spent summer in France
1927-1937	Instructor of French at Yale
1930	Married Harriet Murdoch
1931	Ph.D. Yale: Romance languages
1934	Birth of twins, son Theodor and daughter Margit

1934	Carlos María Ocantos, Argentine Novelist, Yale University; Second printing, 1970; translation Carlos María Ocantos y su obra, 1935, Madrid: Compañía General Española de Libería
1937-1941	Professor of Romance languages, Chairman of the department, American University
1941	French Plays, Edited with Thomas G. Bergin
1941-1943	Associate Professor, Romance languages, Wells College
1943-1945	Professor, Chairman of the department, Wells College
1945-1946	Head, Western European section, Division of Cultural Cooperation, U.S. State Department
1946	Educational Advisor, Office of International Educational Exchange
1946-1951	Associate Professor, Director, undergraduate instruction, French, Yale
1948-1949	Professor in Charge, Sweet Briar Junior Year in France
1951-1954	Director of Master of Arts in Teaching program, Yale
1952	Educational Advisor, Mutual Security Exchange
1953	Director, UNESCO seminar, Nuwara Eliya, Ceylon; The Teaching of Foreign Languages in the Elementary School, D.C. Heath
1954-1955	Associate Director, Master of Arts in Teaching, Yale
1955	The Teaching of Modern Languages, Edited with Felix Walter, UNESCO
1955-1956	Associate Secretary, Associate Director, Foreign Language Program, Modern Language Association
1956-1957	Director, Foreign Language Program, MLA
1957	Professor, Romance languages, University of Texas at Austin; beginning of collaboration and crucial friendship with Mildred Boyer
1959;1962	U.S. Delegate, UNESCO Institute for Education, Hamburg, Germany
1960	Director, Research Study Conference on Leadership of Role of State Supervisors of Foreign Languages, ("Foggy Bottom Conference"), George Washington University
1959-1965	Chairman of the department of Romance languages, University of Texas
1964-1965	Ford Foundation program specialist for modern languages, Santiago, Chile
1965-1980	Professor Romance languages & Education, University of Texas
1968-1969	Director, Bilingual Design Project, Southwest Educational Development Labs, Austin, Texas
1969	Foreign Languages in the Elementary School: A Struggle Against Mediocrity, University of Texas Press
1969-1970	Director of bilingual section, Southwest Educational Development Labs

1970	Bilingual Schooling in the United States, with Mildred Boyer, Southwest Educational Development Labs
1970-1971	Resource specialist, Southwest Educational Development Labs
1973	President, American Association of Teachers of Spanish and Portuguese
1977	Bilingualism in Early Childhood, Edited with W.F. Mackey, (Eds.)
1978	Revised Edition, Bilingual Schooling in the United States, Austin: National Educational Laboratory Publishers
1980	Professor Emeritus, University of Texas
1981	A Guide to Family Reading in Two Languages: The Preschool Years, National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education
1983	With Robert Lado and Ragnhild SÖderbergh, Founded the International Preschool Literacy Association (now the International Association for Literacy from Infancy)
1994	Died July 28, Austin, Texas

Since 1979, Tug had been collecting parent accounts of their children's early literacy and biliteracy, with the plan of publishing an anthology of cases. He accumulated over 20 cases, but intermittent distractions such as travel and poor health prevented him from completing this book. (He has left that task to me.) He continued to write and speak during this time as health permitted, however, and his latest article "Parents As Teachers" appeared in Hispania in May 1992.

FLES After Fifty
The Bilingual Legacy of Theodore Andersson

William F. Mackey
Centre international de recherche en
aménagement linguistique
Université Laval, Québec

Fifty years ago in America a foreign language was, for most people, either a school subject which one could take in senior high and soon forget, or an immigrant tongue which, being foreign to the nation, should soon be forgotten.

So many Americans I would converse with on trains and bus trips, would casually reveal when the talk turned to language that they had spoken such-and-such a language at home as children but had long forgotten it. Its continued use had been discouraged both in school and in the community — if not at home since its vaguely un-American flavor bore what Einar Haugen was later to call: "the stigmata of bilingualism". Coupled with this, was the accepted notion among educators that the insertion of a foreign language in elementary education could lead to "backwardness in basic subjects" and feelings of insecurity. And there was a literature to prove it.[1]

Such was the atmosphere into which a young Yale language instructor had entered; a generation later, it was to be completely transformed, thanks largely to his leadership and unrelenting efforts.

As an observer of this transformation, I welcomed the demise of that trait of 19th century nationalism which, after causing so much havoc in Europe, had dominated the era of isolationism in the United States submerging those policies of ethnic tolerance under which America had prospered.[2]

In the mid-forties, I was at Harvard: it was after the upheaval of the Second World War which had shocked the United States out of its isolationism. Everything, it seemed, was now being rethought; and great issues were continually debated, including the type and content of education best suited to a "free-society". The upshot of this debate was a Report on the future of education (The Conant Report) presented by the president of Harvard to the president of the United States.[3] This gave rise to a number of innovations. I remember, for example, the creation of a humanities program designed specifically for teaching as a career as opposed to education as a profession. It was called "The Master of Arts in Teaching" program at Yale University in 1951. Theodore Andersson had been appointed as its director. Was it this challenge, I now wonder that ignited that sacred fire of reform which so long sustained his remarkable mission? I did not know Theodore Andersson at the time for I had left Harvard to train language teachers at the University of London.

Yet even in Europe we began to hear echos from America of a movement promoting the teaching of foreign languages in elementary school. It eventually took on the acronym of FLES. But it was only years later that I was to meet "Mr. FLES" himself who, in his self-effacing efficiency insisted on being called "Tug". The name belied the demeanor of this tall and distinguished academic who combined the highest professional standards with an unpretentious

humility, while embodying the character of what my father used to identify as that of "a scholar and a gentleman". I had met few of them before, and have met fewer since.

It is true that in the intervening time, I had spotted this authority on FLES at various conferences, had read some of his inspiring articles and particularly his much quoted book which first appeared in 1953 in Boston.[3] What impressed me on first reading was the range of evidence and arguments put forward, drawing on such varied disciplines as psychology, sociology, neurology and education. It was a break from the reductionist monodisciplinary literature of the past in which one experiment was supposed to prove one thing.

In less than a decade the number of FLES programs in the United States had increased forty-fold. On the face of such success, Tug Andersson had the courage to look back at the evidence with a critical eye. He noted that primary school teachers did not speak the foreign language well enough to teach the oral skills; and the native speakers rarely knew how to teach their language to foreigners. The methodology in fashion was often limited to the grammatical drill and pattern practice fashionable at the time among secondary school teachers. Language was disconnected and used out of context. Since there was little or no reading or writing, the program was not taken seriously by secondary school teachers. And since it was not articulated with the secondary level, graduates of FLES often had to start as beginners once they reached highschool. One of the stated goals of FLES was to create bilinguals. Both the goals and the standards proved to be unattainable in the time allotted to foreign language instruction. Tug could see that a few hours a week of exposure to a language in school could hardly tap the language learning potential of the child, especially if the language functioned as just another school subject. What was needed to master the language was more time and more functions. A start in this direction was provided with the creation of FLICS (Foreign Language Innovative Curricula Studies) which, although it was at first limited to heritage languages, opened up the avenue for the use of a foreign language as a medium of instruction.

As FLES expanded in quantity, it thus increased in diversity to include not only FLICS, but also the FLEX (Foreign Language Experience) programs in kindergarten and elementary schools, to the use of a foreign language in the teaching of a selected number of subjects (partial immersion), and finally to the teaching of all subjects in the foreign language (total immersion).[4]

For the full language learning potential of children to be achieved, however, would require a realistic bilingual education program. This would be the full-flowering of FLES. It was therefore not surprising that Tug Andersson became one of the most ardent promotors of early bilingual education. It was in this context that I was to have the pleasure of really meeting him.

This was in 1969. I learned that Theodore Andersson and Mildred Boyer — as an extension of their second survey of bilingual schooling in the United Sates — would be coming to Canada to visit its bilingual schools — particularly the already famous early French immersion schools in the Montreal area associated with the name of Wally Lambert of McGill University.[5] I was happy to learn that they would also visit our newly founded International Center for Research on Bilingualism at Laval University in Quebec City. In fact, they spent the better part of a week in Quebec; and I was honored to be invited to contribute to the second edition of their Bilingual Schooling in the United States.

Stressing the importance of case studies of how children became and remained bilingual, Tug showed a keen interest in the language development of our own household, after he learned of our daily use of five languages. He was particularly, interested in documenting how our

children became and remained literate and fluent in three of those languages — German, French and English — and he insisted that we write it up, perhaps in a short book. We pleaded lack of time, since my wife and I then had urgent academic commitments; but eventually, after much begging off, my wife agreed to do an article on the language strategies used by our family to assure language maintenance. The article finally appeared as a chapter in the book which Tug and I edited in 1970 for Newbury House (now Harper & Row).[6] My collaboration with him on the editing of this volume was one of the smoothest and agreeable of my career. It was then that I learned to appreciate Tug's high standards and true professionalism.

It remained for me to see the man in his natural milieu to appreciate the depth of his humanity and the warmth of his personality. This occasion was provided to me in 1974 when I accepted an invitation (instigated possibly by Tug himself) from The University of Texas to work with the Foreign Language Education program. This developed into one of my most pleasant terms; I remember enjoying the Texas-sized hospitality with which I was received. I particularly look back at a week-end when, as a guest of Tug in Austin, we spent a day sailing the 75-mile-long chain of lakes, finishing up with a real Western cook-out.

By that time, both FLES and bilingual education — so innovative a generation earlier — were becoming commonplace; not only in the United States, but also abroad. Soon one could look back at a generation of successful bilingual schooling, some of it already well documented, especially in the South and Southwest of the United States. In Florida, the successful Coral Way Bilingual School had served as a model for more than a dozen bilingual schools in the Miami area -— enough to provide data for a comparative study.

I shared with Tug a preference for good descriptions of successful bilingual programs. So, with the indispensable help of the principal of Coral Way, Von Nida Beebe, I embarked on a study of the structure and evolution of each of these bilingual school programs in the context in which they had been created, that is, the first two waves of Cuban refugees.[7] It was part of a series of case studies on bilingual education which included those of Lambert and Tucker, Andrew Cohen, Bruce Gaarder, Bernard Spolsky and my own study of the ten-year development of the remarkable public bilingual Kennedy school in Berlin. The latter was one of the European schools inspired by the FLES movement publicized in Germany by Heinz Kloss.[8]

In retrospect, it would be difficult to apportion credit for the phenomenal expansion of this movement. One must study the symbiosis of different contents, blending to create a climate favorable to pluralism in both America and Europe. In America, one must take into account the cumulative sociocultural and psychosocial effects of thousands of veterans coming back from wars in all quarters of the globe, including Europe, Japan, Korea and Vietnam, coupled with the intergenerational counter-cultural revolution, the revolt of the ethnic minorities, the Sputnik psychosis of the cold war, the explosion in long-distance intercommunication, the mass movement of distant peoples and the globalisation of culture.

Yet contexts do not make changes; people do. Institutions do not respond automatically to social changes. On the contrary, their bureaucracies tend toward inertia. It takes people of vision to point the direction, initiate changes, and incite slow-moving bureaucracies to action. I think it can be said without exaggeration that the person who did this most successfully, most consistently and most extensively in the history of bilingual schooling in America was none other than our admirable friend, Theodore Andersson.

Notes

1. This I found difficult to believe; so I undertook a critical review of the literature, the conclusion of which I later published (W.F. Mackey, "Bilingualism and Education," Pédagogie-Orientation 6 (1952) 2:135-147). I was glad to read later in the early work of Lambert & Peel and in the writings of Wilder Penfield, that my criticism had some support.

2. For a well-documented description of such policies, we can refer back to Chapters 3 and 9 of THe American Bilingual Tradition by Heinz Kloss (Rowley: Newbury House, 1977).

3. Theodore Andersson, The Teaching of Foreign Languages in the Elementary School, Boston: Heath, 1953. This first ground-breaking book was understandably more idealistic than what followed in 1969 after the phenomenal expansion of FLES and the struggle to convert quantitative gains to achievements of quality. The new book: Foreign Languages in the Elementary School: A Struggle Against Mediocrity, Austin & London: University of Texas Press. Subsequent publications demonstrate a growing expertise in bilingual education: Theodore Andersson, Resource Guide to Bilingual Education: A Selective Bibiliography of Recent Publications, Austin, Tex.: National Educational Laboratory Publishers, 1978. Theodore Andersson, Mildred Boyer, Bilingual Schooling in the United States, 2nd ed. rev., Austin, Tex.: National Educational Laboratory Publishers, 1978. Tug was particularly keen on demonstrating the feasibility of pre-school literacy: Theodore Andersson, A Guide to Family Reading in Two Languages: The Preschool Years, Los Angeles: Evaluation, Dissemination and Assessment Center, California State University, 1977.

4. See Gladys C. Lipton's Practical Handbook to Elementary Foreign Language Programs: Including FLES, FLEX, and Immersion Programs, Lincolnwood: National Textbook Co. 1998.

5. Wallace E. Lambert and G.R. Tucker. Bilingual Education of Children: The St. Lambert Experiment, Rowley: Newbury House.

6. William F. Mackey and Theodore Andersson (eds.), Bilingualism in Early Childhood, Rowley: Newbury House, 1977.

7. William F. Mackey and Von Nida Beebe, Bilingual Schools for a Bicultural Community: Miami's Response to the Cuban Refugeees, Rowley: Newbury House 1977; Revised in 1990 by Von Beebe under the title: Von N. Beebe and W.F. Mackey, Bilingual Schooling and the Miami Experience. Miami: Institute of Interamerican Studies, 1990.

8. Heinz Kloss, FLES: zum Problem des Fremdsprachen-unterrichts an Grundschulen Amerikas und Europas, Godesberg: Verlag Wissenschaftliches Archiv, 1967.

Some Early Encounters

Joshua A. Fishman
Professor Emeritus, Yeshiva University (NY
and Visiting Professor, Stanford University (CA)

I first heard of "Tug" Andersson in 1958, that is, some 36 years ago. I was planning what later became my Language Loyalty in the United States. The problem was that no one knew much about the language resources of the USA or whether they were getting larger or smaller; there had been no census data on mother tongues since 1940. Even if there was to be some such census data in 1960--a concession a very few of us ultimately bludgeoned a reluctant Bureau of the Census into making--data on mother tongue of the foreign-born (the only thing the Bureau would agree to collect) could not begin to disclose the world of native non-English language schools, press, radio, and local religious units. Neither could it shed light on the state of language use by different generations of speakers. So I brashly began looking about for allies who would help me convince the Bureau to do more than it had reluctantly agreed to do. I searched high and low for ethnic organizations that would protest about this to their local senators and representatives. I searched for academic allies--language professionals, we would call them today--who might have contacts in Washington and could twist a few arms on behalf of better language data to benefit American education, commerce, industry, and diplomacy. I wrote to the Modern Language Association, asking if they knew of anyone in the organization who was worried about the fact that more Americans were probably forgetting (or denying) the French, German, Spanish, Italian, Polish, Yiddish, etc., etc. that they had acquired at home as children than were learning these languages however inadequately in the schools. Imagine my delight when I was told that there were some members with concerns of that kind, and imagine my dismay when I found out that they were exactly two in number. Their names were Theodore Andersson and Howard Nostrand.

I began corresponding with these two truly exceptional teachers of teachers of "foreign languages," and remember them as very different correspondents. Nostrand was intellectually critical; Andersson was emotionally supportive. I desperately needed both the one and the other, of course, but criticism without support, at that tender stage in my life (I was all of 32 years old!), would have devastated me. Andersson "held my hand". He was grand-fatherly. He was encouraging. He was an ally, a friend, a big brother, a counselor. He was there.

I don't know exactly how it came about--although I have my suspicions and, indeed, they also involve Tug Andersson--but all of my conceptual, methodological, and public interest arguments wound up on the desk of a dedicated public servant, Bruce Gaarder, who was on the staff of the Language Research Section of the Office of Education in Washington. Instead of my having to convince him, he called me and invited me to apply to him for funds to launch a nationwide study of the language resources of American ethnolinguistic groups. His only substantive stipulation was that if I decided to highlight any particular languages after covering the waterfront of languages and topics that I try to include Spanish in the Southwest among those

given particular attention. I got the grant, of course, and for the next three years I sent out quarterly reports to the Language Research Branch and to a small group of interested academics in psychology, sociology, linguistics, and education, Tug Andersson among them. Again, Tug always had something encouraging and helpful to say. He urged me on; he applauded my progress; he assured me that what I was doing was significant at the very least, and quite possibly even vital. When Language Loyalty in the United States finally appeared in 1966, he was one of its first and most enthusiastic readers. It was much later, however, that I figured out that both Andersson and Gaarder were Texans, were deeply interested in Spanish in the American Southwest, were deeply concerned with communities rather than just classrooms as language teaching and acquisition contexts and that they knew each other well. Could it have been Andersson who put Gaarder in touch with me? I wouldn't put it past him.

From the time I had first been introduced to Tug to the time Language Loyalty was being read and reviewed, a decade (1958-1968) had elapsed. But what a decade it had been! The Vietnam War and the ethnic revival were both at their high-points, and so was the revolt of large sections of American youth against the establishment in government, education, and culture. An extensive counter-culture had developed and, with it came a veritable sea-change in the recognition of the key role of language in American elementary education and in ethnic community life. In 1969 the Bilingual Education Act was passed, but Tug and I both knew that it was coming, both of us having been called to testify in 1968 in connection with the bills that were then being introduced in both houses of Congress. Almost predictably, however, we both became critics of the new Act we had initially favored and supported. We rejected its remedial, compensatory, and transitional characteristics, characteristics that made it, in many ways, a travesty of genuine bilingual education. Tug demonstrated this in a typically Tuggish way, by assembling his and Mildred Boyer's exhaustive accounts of bilingual programs throughout the country. In preparing their two exemplary volumes, they both traveled to various field sites. That made it possible for our paths to cross again, in Hawaii, during the 1968-69 academic year.

I was a Senior Specialist at the East-West Center at the University of Hawaii at Manoa that year and, as luck would have it, Tug and Mildred visited Oahu in their search for superior bilingual programs. I invited them both to meet Gella and our three boys at our home in Kailua, and they spent several hours with us. It quickly became apparent to them that ours was not an English-speaking household; yet our children spoke English fluently and flawlessly to Tug and Mildred and then turned to Gella and me in equally accomplished Yiddish. Tug was delighted. Our children were obviously bilingual and bicultural at a very sophisticated level and, it was also obvious that Gella and I had worked equally hard (and were still working hard) to make them so. "Those are the kind of kids that public bilingual education should aim at producing," Tug said. I realized that he was doing it again, encouraging me to take and maintain a position that was in advance of that which was generally expressed. Since then, I have said many times that bilingual education will really be supported for the poor and for the minorities only when and if it is also introduced into American public education for the mainstream middle-class, being either maintenance- or enrichment-oriented for one and all. And each time I have said this I have seen Tug in my mind's eye, nodding his approval and being encouraging, supportive, helping me onward in our joint quest for true cultural democracy in America.

And now the time has come for us to pay Tug back in coin of his own realm, i.e., to encourage him to "keep on keepin on"; to continue being the moral and ethical and motivational

"advance guard" of language teaching, of language teacher training, of genuine bilingual education efforts, of language and culture and language and society emphases, of language resource appreciation and development; in short: to continue being the incomparable, indefatigable, unstoppable, unflappable, ever-warmhearted, standard-setting, frontier-defining, visionary practitioner and practical visionary, ever upbeat "Mr. Language Education, USA" that he has been all these years. What a way to live!

Yet Another Tribute

Wallace Lambert, McGill University

It is very easy and perfectly natural for many people to present their tributes to Theodore Andersson, but in thinking through my contribution to this collection, I find myself primarily "attributing" things to him rather than "tributing." Hopefully, though, the intended tributes will show through. Still, attributing things to Tug gives me a start. After all, when so much is traceable to a person, he or she has to stand up and take it. I say this because I hear that Tug Andersson is not feeling too well and is not as active as usual--and all that bothers me. There are special people who don't have a right to not feel well, to slow down, or even to outright quit. Tug is one of those people. It's like Fred Astair and Louis Armstrong; they had no right to leave us. Nor do Sinatra, Artie Shaw, George Burns, or Michael Jordan have a right to slow down; the rest of us need to hear and see such people. (Incidentally, Artie Shaw recently explained his disappearance from the scene (Zwerin, 1994) with the sophistic arguments that he didn't need the money involved in performing and, anyway, those of us who danced or just listened to him were in his thinking basically "morons." My response is that Shaw should keep his opinions of us to himself because we morons still need to hear him, regardless of what he thinks. He started it all in the first place, not us morons!)

All this is to indicate that Tug Andersson has no right to hang up his cleats, because he started too many things. Now he has to stand up and take credit for them. In his case, some of the seeds he planted are, in my mind, just now coming splendidly to bloom. So Tug, while we wish you a happier and healthier 1994, you should brace yourself because you are in for a lot of tributing and attributing, which is just the way it should be.

My credentials for making attributions are that I've been around a long while and I've known Tug over many of those years. I first met him in 1961 at a conference on language teaching in San Juan, Puerto Rico, and what impressed me was how he impressed my wife, Janine, a native of France. This tall, handsome Texan charmed her first with his French. This, she told me, was a "civilized and erudite" gentleman, so civilized in fact that he "couldn't be an American"! Piqued as I was with that comment, I approached this paragon carefully. But I soon found out that there was nothing phoney about him, that he was very likeable.

Moreover, regardless of what the French may think, he was completely American in the very best sense. We went swimming one afternoon and he explained how one of his long legs was all stitched up because he once got pinned against a pole trying to stop his old car from rolling down a hill. But more than this, he was multi-cultural: as sincere and civilized in the eyes of our Puerto Rican hosts at the conference, with whom he was perfectly comfortable speaking Spanish, as he was speaking French to my wife. All this leads up to my first attribution to Tug, because two of the host group were Angel Quintero (then Minister of Education in P.R.) and Sylvia Viera, a leading young professor there. Both of them revealed to me that they sent their best graduate students to Austin to work with Andersson, Mildred Boyer, and their colleagues. Tug therefore was their pivotal liaison in introducing the potentials of American education to the intellectual leaders of P.R. They trusted him and modeled on his approach to language learning. Simultaneously, for his Anglo-American students, he opened the way to the Hispanic world with affection, understanding, and enthusiasm.

At that Puerto Rican conference, our task was to explore effective ways to educate children bilingually. Many of us in attendance (I remember Robert Lado, Charles Ferguson, Uriel Weinreich especially) had specific suggestions to offer, but it was Tug who had the clear view of the big picture of bilingual education (Lado, Lambert, and Andersson, 1962). This grasp of the fundamentals became clear somewhat later when Tug and Mildred Boyer published their landmark volume on bilingual schooling (1970). Their first chapter of that book alone (pp.1-6) provides one of the most valuable introductions to bilingualism and biculturalism in the United States that I know. The main point in this example is that Tug and Mildred Boyer not only integrated what was known about the issues, but they also ferreted out the fundamentals of bilingual education and thereby gave many of us hope and direction in our own research--this in a time when home was not at all commonplace.

It was that direction and hope generated by my associations with Tug Andersson that gave me the courage in the mid-60's to try out some radical ideas about how one might be able to get bilingual education started in Canadian public schools. Actually, all the basic features of our language "immersion" programs had been anticipated by Tug, and so it was a great delight in 1969 to have Tug and Mildred come to Montreal and visit our French immersion classes. After a 5-year trial period, those classes were popping up in various schools. Tug and Mildred were delighted with what they saw and they took the time to highlight for us what they thought were the essentials: that early-grade Anglo children were actually sitting at desks in rows, listening attentively to, or following the directions of, a teacher who was using French only; and that, at the same time they were actively making things or taking them apart as a hands-on mode of learning, they were also gradually breaking the new language code and learning about another cultural group through the teacher. Most important for Tug and Mildred was the fact that the children were enjoying the whole experience, treating it as if it were what transpired normally in all schools. They had never been to any other kind! For us on the local scene, unsure as we were of what we were really up to, the blessings of those two visitors were extremely encouraging. What this means is that the success of immersion schooling is also attributable to Tug and his colleagues. Of course if anything goes wrong in the long haul, Tug will be partly to blame!

Finally, I keep thinking of what Tug and the rest of us ancient mariners in the bilingual education field actually got going back in the late 50's. In other words, "How does our garden grow?" as an old poem had it. Well, Tug Andersson can be particularly proud of his involvement because,even as the inter-ethnic-group tension in America becomes sharper as demands for equality and fairness become louder and more convincing,
Americans are now fully aware that we have become a rich and vibrant multi-ethnic society and that bilingual education, including programs like two-way bilingual schooling (Cazabon, Lambert, and Hall, 1993) that brings cultural groups together in classes is more essential and valuable now than it ever was. The important point is that that big, tall, handsome Texan deserves the lion's share of credit for all this!

References

Andersson, T., and Boyer, M.V. (1970). Bilingual schooling in the U.S. Austin, Texas: Southwest Educational Development Laboratory.

Cazabón, M., Lambert, W.E., & Hall, G. (1993). Two-way bilingual education: A progress report on the Amigos Program. Santa Cruz: National Center for Research on Cultural Diversity and Second Language Learning.

Lado, R., Lambert, W.E., & Andersson, T. (1962). Relación entre el aprendizaje de una lengua extranjera y el vernáculo. Educatión, 11(3), 11-41.

A Very Sane Man of La Mancha

Robert Lado, Professor Emeritus
Georgetown University

I, Robert Lado, a friend and admirer of Professor Theodore Andersson, would like to highlight some contributions of Professor Andersson--"Tug" as he likes to be called--as a national and international modern language scholar and leader.

I first worked with Professor Andersson in the late 1950's in the MLA project to develop Modern Spanish. He brought together a national committee that produced that state of the art text, conceived for the purpose of modernizing foreign language teaching in the U.S. He deftly kept us together, hammering away at the guidelines and scope of the project. That was quite a feat, given the committee of gifted but diverse minds and personalities, including some prima donnas. He entertained us at his home and made us feel that we had accomplished our objective. That success was clearly vintage Tug Andersson.

I later experienced his high professional spirit and ideals at a bilingual education meeting in Texas where he proposed and passed a resolution against the law forbidding the use of native language on the school grounds. Real professional statesmanship was required to overcome ultranationalist prejudices against non-English languages and cultures on that occasion. Tug Andersson steered the discussion and succeeded. Like a modern day, enlightened, very sane Man of La Mancha, he charged against that prejudice. Without breaking his lance he carried through to success. I admired him for his ideals and his statesmanship then, and do so again now as we honor him.

Again a Chairman of the National Advisory Committee for Bilingual Education, he defined bilingual education not as a device to impose English but as education to develop educated bilinguals who would use their bilingualism as an asset to themselves and to their country.

Finally, I would like to recognize his pioneering work and contributions to preschool reading as a way to enhance the education of children. That contribution--which remains very close to his heart--was and still is known only to a limited number of scholars around the world. He recognized its importance, and moved against the entrenched notion that it was not possible, that if tried it would be damaging to the children. He guided parents to play their way to teaching their young children to read at home.

One of the first in this country to know the importance of Ragnhild Söderbergh's Reading in Early Childhood, he piloted its republication by the Georgetown University Press after the first issue sold out quickly in Sweden. He was co-founder of the International Preschool Reading Association, now the International Association for Literacy from Infancy. He co-edited a book of articles, Early Reading, published by the Georgetown University Press.

Tug, we are heavily in your debt. Your battles will go on. Bilingual education is here to stay. Early education, and with it earlier literacy, is moving forward. It is no longer unlawful to speak the native language in schools. Educated bilinguals have reached the level of the President's cabinet.

The distrust of people who speak two languages is still with us, as seen in the only-English movement, but its advocacy is being driven underground. We thank you, Tug Andersson

for being who you are--Theodore Andersson, brilliant scholar, cultural leader, with highest ideals and the talent and generosity to promote them successfully. Well done, good and faithful friend.

Theodore Andersson: Pioneer, Visionary, Educator

George M. Blanco
The University of Texas at Austin

What can I say about a man whose entire professional life has been devoted to language education on a state, national, and international scale? In the 32 years that I have known Tug (32 years! Good grief, I'm almost a senior citizen myself!), I've met few individuals who were as completely obsessed with language education as he. I use the term "obsessed" in a positive way, because Tug has lived and breathed language education, especially in reference to the Spanish language of the Southwest.

I first heard of Dr. Theodore Andersson in 1961, when I was a public school teacher in El Paso. It seemed that this Dr. Andersson (I was sure there was a misprint, because as everyone knows, Anderson is written with only one s.)...it seemed that this Dr. Andersson of Austin, Texas, had a project or a plan to establish a closer relationship between The University of Texas and the Texas public schools. His plan was to bring to UT Austin a series of public school teachers to teach in the Department of Romance Languages, of which he served as Chair. I looked on this plan with a certain amount of suspicion, quite frankly because, first of all, university professors weren't quite human; they were to be looked on in complete reverence and awe. Besides, typically, they were only interested in lofty topics like literature, morphology, and syntax which befitted their high intellectual profession, and certainly not in the least interested in what public school teachers were doing. The notion that a public school teacher could possibly have anything of value to tell and share with an institution of higher education was absolutely mind boggling at the time. Why in the world was this man from the flagship university undertaking this bizarre project? It was certainly a project which would have been considered beneath the dignity of my own local alma mater, Texas Western College, which later became the University of Texas at El Paso (UTEP). I am quite certain that had any local university faculty members proposed such a harebrained plan, they would have been run out of town.

I was encouraged to apply, since one of my colleagues, Marie Esman Barker, had accepted the position the first year. I thought there was no way he would select two people from El Paso in consecutive years. But, either I was the one Tug wanted, or perhaps other public school teachers were even more suspicious of his wild plan than I, limiting the selection pool to me. Who knows. I have never asked him. I was young and I thought going off to the distant city of Austin would be an adventure. Besides, what did I have to lose? It was to be a one-year assignment, and I would be back in El Paso before I realized it. Thirty-two years later, I'm still in Austin.

When I finally met Tug Andersson in person, I was very impressed by his down-to-earth manner, and his way of making me feel genuinely welcome in his department. "George," he said, "You're a public school teacher, and you have a great deal to share with us at the university." "I do?," I questioned. "Absolutely, you bring with you a sense of the real world, and that's what we've lost sight of at this level of education." I had never heard such words from a university professor. So began a long history of professional contact with Theodore Andersson--not all pleasant, I might add, but more about that later.

Looking back, that year of teaching lower division Spanish courses at UT Austin was an exciting one. You can just imagine rubbing shoulders and sharing ideas with the likes of such academic luminaries as Ramón Martínez López, Joseph Matluck, Mildred Boyer, Fred Ellison, Ricardo Gullón. And there I was, I who at the time had not even completed the Master's degree. Tug wanted me not only to teach, but also to analyze the language curriculum of the department, and to make a formal report which he as chairman would share with his colleagues in an attempt to improve the status quo. This was pretty heady stuff for me, as you can well imagine. I was also encouraged to establish links with the College of Education by supervising student teachers under the direction of Joseph Michel. From time to time, Tug would stop me in the hall or drop by my office just to see how I was doing, letting me give him a progress report on my activities. At these times, he put me at ease, and he gave me a reassuring sense that what I had to say was important to him and to the university.

My stay in Austin was supposed to be for one year I have said, but as the end of the assignment approached, as per Tug's encouragement, I applied for a position as consultant in foreign languages with the Texas Education Agency (TEA). During my year at UT Austin, I had also assisted TEA with inservice activities, and the position, which would open in May of that year, was one that interested me very much. As I recall, I was the first professional TEA ever hired without a master's degree, and I suspect that Tug's strong support and recommendation were instrumental in TEA's decision. After I had taken the job, Tug said, "George, you're in a strategic position at TEA. You have an opportunity to make an impact on language education in Texas."

Meanwhile, back at the university, a third individual was brought to campus to fill the post that I had the previous year. That year, Tug selected a teacher from South Texas: his name was Albar Peña. It is significant that the three individuals whom Tug selected for his special program back in the 60's, Marie Esman Barker (UTEP), Albar Peña, and I, all went on to obtain doctorates and, ultimately, to move into the field of bilingual education.

It was in 1963 that Theodore Andersson approached me to obtain my reaction to a concept that he had been mulling over in his mind. It had to do with educating Mexican American children in Spanish. I thought this was absolutely crazy. I came from that background. I had grown up speaking Spanish and learned English in school, with the end result of my being bilingual. I saw no benefit in teaching Spanish speakers to read first in Spanish and then in English because, I argued, it would keep them behind. (Isn't it funny how the basic principles of bilingual education which we take for granted now, were looked on at the time as being completely off the wall.) I told Tug that I would think about it and that I would get back to him. We began a series of conversations, and it was not long before he had shown me the error of my ways; he convinced me of the value of dual-language instruction. It made perfect sense.

The 60's in Texas were fascinating times for bilingual education. Marie Esman Barker initiated what started out as the Southwest Council of Foreign Language Teachers, but soon became the Southwest Council on Bilingualism. I strongly suspect that Tug had something to do with the change of name and focus of this seminal group. During the years in which the Council operated, a series of pioneers presented papers on the language and the education of Mexican Americans: Chester Christian, Bruce Gaarder, Mildred Boyer, Garland Bills, Rudolph Troike and, of course, Theodore Andersson.

In 1964 Harold Brantley, the Superintendent of the United Consolidated Independent School District (ISD) in Laredo, came to talk to officials of the Texas Education Agency about obtaining permission to conduct an experimental dual-language program in his school. At the time, the Texas Penal Code prohibited the use of languages other than English for instruction in public schools, except of course in foreign language classrooms. Since Tug had already "brainwashed" me, I was able to argue in favor of granting this special permission to use Spanish for instruction. It should come as no surprise that it was Tug, always the rabble-rouser, who had approached the Laredo United Consolidated SD to initiate this program. At approximately the same time, Tom Horn, Chairman of the Department of Curriculum and Instruction at UT Austin, in collaboration with Tug, convinced the Edgewood ISD in San Antonio to initiate an experimental dual-language program. Among the teachers in this effort was Gloria Zamora.

The pioneer programs of Edgewood and Laredo were similar in that they presented the basic subjects in Spanish. The student populations, however, were different: Edgewood was 100% Mexican American, while Laredo United Consolidated ISD had both Mexican American and Anglo participants in a two-way bilingual education program. There were no instructional materials to speak of, and so teachers constructed their own. Teachers relied on their own initiative and creativeness, and they constantly called on Theodore Andersson and Tom Horn to assist them or to give them moral support when they were overwhelmed. I am positive that during those times, Tug spent as much time traveling in the cause of bilingual education as he did directing the Department of Romance Languages. That arrangement, however, was to the benefit of bilingual education. He was a constant presenter at inservice meetings for teachers, administrators, and school board members. He participated in state and national hearings on bilingual education. In Washington, he participated in hearings that lead to the eventual passage of Title VII. In Texas, Senator Carlos Truán relied heavily on Theodore Andersson in obtaining the necessary information on language and language education that culminated in the Texas Bilingual Education Law.

At one point in his role of rabble-rouser during the turbulent 60's, Theodore Andersson, in collaboration with Mildred Boyer, published a stinging special issue of the *Texas Foreign Language Bulletin*. Its headlines fairly screamed, "Texas Squanders Its Spanish Language Resources!" The bulletin, which had a wide circulation among the foreign language teaching profession (bilingual education teachers were few and far between in those pre-NABE, pre-TABE, and pre-CABE days), leveled a charge at the Texas public schools of literally and deliberately wasting a tremendously valuable linguistic and cultural resource in the name of "education." It pointed out that the schools were doing absolutely nothing to preserve, maintain, and promote a natural resource which some people arduously tried to develop in themselves through years of study, and not always with success. Not only were the state and the educational establishment not promoting Spanish, the bulletin went on to assert, but they were doing everything in their power, politically and socially, to eradicate it. TEA, being the agency for education in the state, was not amused.

During this period, Theodore Andersson and Mildred Boyer took a leave from UT Austin to work at the Southwest Educational Development Laboratory. Their work culminated in the monumental two-volume, *Bilingual Schooling in the United States*, which continues to be a benchmark publication in the field.

Theodore Andersson had always shown a great deal of impatience with the educational bureaucracy, whether it was the university's or the state's. I, of course, had become an official member of the state bureaucracy, and there were times when Tug thought I was not effective in promoting the language policies and programs which the state needed. I argued that I was but a small cog in the bureaucratic machinery. Tug retorted by saying that that was no excuse. This period in our relationship was not the best. Time and circumstances, however, have had a way of allowing us to put things in perspective. Our professional relationship survived and flourished, particularly after I went back to UT Austin to work in the area of bilingual education.

Tug's fascination with early childhood reading, particularly in those cases where children learned to read in two languages, has continued to be one of the important interests of his professional life. He has documented any number of cases in which children of both immigrant and non-immigrant parents were painlessly and joyfully taught to read in two languages. It is beyond him why the public schools can't do likewise. Quite the contrary, he argues, most schools kill any enjoyment young children might accrue in the reading process. His publications on the topic are numerous in both monographs and professional journals. He has always been interested in how I learned to read both English and Spanish, and he has encouraged me to write an account up for inclusion in one of his publications. He thought it was quite remarkable that my grandmother taught me to read in Spanish by reading the Spanish-language newspapers and funnies to me. This came about because my father noticed I'd begun code-switching, and became afraid I was going to forget my Spanish. We didn't refer to it as "code-switching," of course. But since Spanish was the language of our home and my father enforced it very strictly, he was dismayed that at the age of six, after I started school, I started inserting English words into otherwise Spanish sentences. This would not do. Tug thinks this is something that should be documented, and I just may get around to it soon.

Throughout these remarks, I have referred to Theodore Andersson by his first name or his nickname. I must point out, however, that it was not until approximately 1978 that I started addressing him as "Tug." At his insistence. On several occasions in which he attempted to bring me around, I had informed him that the difficulty was a cultural one, and that it was hard because my Mexican upbringing discouraged me from addressing a superior and *una persona mayor* by his first name, let alone his nickname. He let me know in no uncertain terms that he was well aware of my culture, and that there were many hard things in this life, this being one of them, but I would have to call him "Tug." "All right.....TTTug, I'll try." I mention this anecdote, as evidence of his lack of pretentiousness and as evidence that he deals with his friends and colleagues in a natural and genuinely human manner.

As a foreign language educator and visionary, Theodore Andersson sees the need for maintaining and promoting all native languages spoken in the United States. He sees the need for a close working relationship between the two related yet often distant fields of foreign languages and bilingual education; their promoters should work in tandem rather than pulling away from each other as they have at times tended to do. Indeed, he is the premier example: academician in French and Spanish, graduate of Yale, and simultaneously, promoter of bilingual education. He sees no conflict in this and neither do I. As far as the academician is concerned, he often says, "The academician in the family is my son, Ted, professor of Germanic languages at Stanford. I'm just a language promoter." Well, thank goodness for language promoters. Tug Andersson,

educator, academician, visionary, language promoter. Bilingual education in the United States is in large measure due to your vision and your pioneering efforts. We thank you.

An Intellectual Foundation for Bilingual Education

Eugene García, Director
Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Language Affairs

It seems fitting for me to be here as Director of OBEMLA to recognize the intellectual contribution of Theodore Andersson to the education of language minority children. I do not know Theodore Andersson well enough to call him "Tug." I call him "Dr. Andersson," mainly because of my respect for the kind of contribution he has made to the work which most of us in this room share.

I'd like to speak to a couple of those contributions, keeping ever mindful of the issues we face today--in bilingual education in particular, and in our more general responsibility for providing services to linguistically different populations. I think the person we honor today has moved the field significantly in the right direction.

I began reading Theodore Andersson's work while I was in graduate school. I was interested in the area of languages and language development. When I first did a search for information about what had been done in the area of bilingualism and bilingual education using ERIC and the Social Science Index in the late 1960's and early 1970's, I think I came up with 70 items. Just to give you an example, I did a similar search for my new book about two years ago, and found more than 2500 references. We've come a long way in our intellectual base and we have some real pioneers to thank for that.

As I read that first search, several names became prominent. There was Troike, and Lado, and Blanco, and Mackey, and Fishman, and Andersson and Andersson and Andersson and Andersson. Those of you who know how prolific he was are aware that you couldn't get far in any publication related to language or education without discovering that he had made a contribution to it.

I think as I read that work I have to admit that it helped me extensively to form an opinion. I myself grew up essentially with Spanish as a first language, and I couldn't help becoming interested personally in this issue of bilingual education--it was for me not only an intellectual matter, but a personal one. Generally what I found among those early references consisted of diatribes, political diatribes--and that's fine. But what I found in the work of Theodore Andersson was different. There I discovered the intellectual hook I was looking for--that most academic and intellectual types look for. These are people who ask themselves, "What does this mean?" They wonder about the meaning of bilingual education in terms of understanding learning and teaching; they wonder about the importance of issues like bilingualism itself as a world phenomenon; they wonder about how we should see the effects and issues of bilingual education. What I found in his writing was precisely that intellectual work, that serious scholarship and thinking. And I think that was critical for me and for others who were the linguists, the psycholinguists, the sociolinguists, and the anthropologists who were seriously exploring these issues. His scholarship reflected the serious attention to the issues that we all desired. He set the stage for the other work that followed. Now I have to admit that I did not always agree with positions that Dr. Andersson took but I appreciated extensively his quiet, thoughtful approach to these issues and, of course, to his scholarship.

Years later, decades later, here I am in a position in Washington. I understand the political notion of Washington and the ramifications of working politically. Deep in my heart, though, I also know how important it is for someone who wants to make a difference in this field to look at a model like Theodore Andersson. The very intellectual wherewithal that he provided us gave people like me something to shoot for.

Now, even as we continue to look at ways to improve the education and linguistic and cultural minority children, to carry it to the next step, Theodore Andersson's work remains quite a model to live up to. All the same, I only hope that someday someone might be able to say something similar about those of us working today.

Scholarship, Geniality, and a Sense of Fun

Muriel Saville-Troike and Rudolph Troike
The University of Arizona

Rudy Troike: I'd like to start off by saying that it is a pleasure to be participating in this occasion to honor Tug's contributions to bilingual education. He was really one of the true pioneers in working to bring bilingual education to the United States.

I came to know Tug when I was an assistant professor at the University of Texas in English and was working with the schools to develop linguistics-based ESL activities in the schools. Tug had already become involved with bilingual education, and I was aware that he had been working with the Coral Way Two-Way Bilingual Program in the Miami, Florida area. I remember meeting him on campus one day and asking him about the results coming out of that experimental program (which of course was conceived to create bilinguals both of the children of English-speaking local families and those of the Spanish-speaking newly arrived immigrants from Cuba.) Tug was very much on top of this and reported some very exciting results. That was really the point at which I first got interested in and became more aware of the significance of bilingual education.

I didn't discover it until sometime after I knew him, but Tug was a member of the Southwest Council of Foreign Language Teaching that had met in El Paso, Texas, and passed a resolution asserting that children could probably do better in school if they were taught through the medium of their native language. At least, at the professional level, that was one of the major initial impetuses for the establishment of bilingual education. It is very interesting to note that the bilingual education movement, at least from one side with Tug's leadership, was established and initiated within the foreign language teaching profession. Once it really became more widely accepted, it pulled away from these foreign language education roots, which is something I have always regretted.

When Tug and Toody Boyer were invited to carry out this survey through the Southwest Educational Lab, Tug called me up at one point and asked me if I would comment on some of the results that they were producing. Out of their survey came the landmark two-volume publication Bilingual Schooling in the United States. For many years this was one of the foundation references for bilingual education in this country. There is a tendency for publications of any kind to be forgotten over a period of time, but this is one that really helped establish bilingual education in the United States. Tug very kindly thanked me for my participation, but to me, it was a very exciting and rewarding thing to be in contact with the project through him and through Toody.

At one point, Tug and Toody were beginning to be interested in looking at bilingual education in American Indian communities; I took the opportunity to introduce him to (then) Muriel Saville, who had been working with Navajo bilingual education. I'm pleased to say that theirs was a very fruitful relationship. She herself has some things to say about that here.

Muriel Saville-Troike: What I remember most fondly about my association with Tug and Toody was taking a grand tour through the Southwest with them. We flew out to Albuquerque together and rented a car and went driving through the Navajo reservation through Window Rock and up to Rock Point to observe ESL programs. Then we drove to Rough Rock to see the

community-controlled school--really the earliest strong effort in bilingual education on the reservation. Next we headed over through the area near Monument Valley, visiting schools all the way. Our purpose was to come to understand some of the educational situations on the Navajo reservation. But we wanted also to get some feel for the needs of faculty, school boards, and parent groups, and for what all the needs were going to be in materials development--for what was going to be needed really to launch bilingual education in this part of the country. We visited materials development centers in Albuquerque and Flagstaff, and that had a very important impact on my own subsequent work in Navajo bilingual education. As I said, though, it was a fun time too; I guess I remember Tug's sense of humor and all the joking and punning and all that went on through this drive almost as much as the scholarly discussion. The trip ended perhaps perfectly by our getting snowed in at the airport in Flagstaff.

But I have so thoroughly enjoyed the time that I have spent with Tug. That enjoyment I appreciate as much--almost as much--as the insights that he gave me about the needs of the minority language community. As I suggested, his insights and what we found out on that trip made a considerable contribution to my own subsequent work when I directed materials development for the first Bureau of Indian Affairs kindergarten and first grade programs on the Navajo reservation. A lot of Tug's thinking (although I don't think I ever told him this before and I am very happy to have the opportunity to tell him now) has provided major input in the materials development.

Rudy: In knowing Tug over the years, I have always admired his special combination of geniality and scholarship. He is an absolutely wonderful person and it is really a pleasure and honor to be able to say this. I think I could just add in closing that I'm reminded of a comment Robert Lado once made--that the worst thing about getting older is that you have more things to live down. At this point, I think Tug Andersson has many more good things to look back on and can feel satisfaction at the important contributions he has made.

A Man With A Clear Vision Of The Big Picture

Chester C. Christian, Jr.
Texas A & M University

From the time I met him in 1963, Tug Andersson impressed me with the breadth of his interests, and the intimate relation of all of these interests to vital human conditions and problems. There has never been an ivory tower for him. Not only has he been ever conscious of such relationships as those between individual and society, and infancy and age, but he has remained continuously involved in extending that consciousness to others. This is a particularly difficult task in an academic setting where most faculty members are so deep in the trenches of their specialization that they have forgotten that there is a big picture. Tug has kept a clear vision of the big picture at the same time as the details, and for that reason his view of the latter has been far more meaningful than that of his colleagues whose focus has been almost exclusively on details.

One of the best examples of this is his involvement since I have known him in three controversial subjects closely related to each other: bilingualism, early reading, and home schooling. When I met him in 1963, these had become some of my major interests, but without Tug I doubt that I would have ever learned their general significance. At that time I was teaching Mexican-American high school students in Spanish. I was much impressed by how much they could learn, especially if they had been reading Spanish from an early age, usually taught by parents and grandparents.

My view of my own experience was not, however, in general terms, as was Tug's view. My view was of El Paso; his was not of El Paso, nor of Texas or the Southwest, nor even of the United States, but of the world. He thought that children everywhere, preferably before school age, should be taught reading and writing in their home language, as well as in any other languages in their environment, and that this practice should be established in the home as well as in the public schools. He told me this in 1963, when I was working on a study of "Spanish in the Southwest."

Although I agreed, it seemed, practically speaking, a far-fetched idea. For one thing, teaching anything but a so-called "foreign" language was at that time illegal in Texas, and I was sure that the government would never permit, much less sponsor, a program to do anything like that. As has happened so many times since I met him, Tug was right and I was wrong. He was right in part because he knew the people who should become convinced, in government, public schools, and other institutions, and he set about convincing them.

Insofar as early reading was concerned, my view was also much more limited that Tug's. The idea that children could, before they were two years old, read letters and words, was a discovery I made with my fifth child, born in 1969.

We spoke only Spanish at home, and one thing I bought for her before she was two years old was an alphabet book from Mexico. I bought it for the pictures rather than the alphabet, but when she pointed to the letters and asked what they were, I told her; she not only learned their names rapidly, but also learned to recognize the combinations--that is, the words. Meanwhile her younger brother learned to read words before the age of two simply by watching her.

I wrote to Tug about it, but it was nothing new to him; he suggested that I read Glenn Doman's How to Teach Your Baby to Read, and that I keep a record of her progress in reading. He also invited me to report on that progress at the Conference on Child Language which he was directing in Chicago. Papers from this conference were later published in Bilingualism in Early Childhood, co-edited by Tug and William Mackey. Since then, he has accumulated data on many similar cases from all over the world, and has assembled them into a yet unpublished book. One of the reasons it is still unpublished is that he is so far ahead of the specialists in reading (who apparently prefer to ignore the facts that he has accumulated) that publishers must believe there is something amiss in these studies. What is amiss is the congealed mass of incorrect assumptions about early learning that has become official, and not only in schools of education. The conventional wisdom still dominates, and it is anything but wisdom.

Before I met Tug, I had written to Howard Lee Nostrand, Professor of French at the University of Washington, about the possibilities of combining sociology and literature for a Ph.D; one of the persons he suggested I contact for further assistance and advice was Theodore Andersson of the University of Texas at Austin. At about the same time, Tug had received a letter from Joshua Fishman, who was directing a project on the language resources of the United States, and looking for someone to conduct a study on Spanish. Tug mentioned this to Carl Rosenquist, a professor of sociology at U.T. Austin who had directed my thesis on prostitution and promiscuity in El Paso, Texas, and Ciudad Juárez, Chihuahua. Carl told him that he thought I understood the language and culture pretty well, so Tug wrote to me at about the same time I wrote to him.

By facilitating the contact between Joshua Fishman and me, Tug changed my life, and that was something he has done often with respect to many others with whom he has come into contact, not only students and colleagues. The way he does it, I think, is relatively simple; he talks to everyone as if they were all rational and motivated by the best of intentions, assuming that what is right is what everyone really wants to do and what will, sooner or later, be done. For example, shortly after the Watergate affair became news I asked Tug what he thought about it; he replied, "Nixon will have to resign." I thought, if I didn't say, "Fat chance." But he was right.

One area in which Tug has always shown far more faith than I have ever been able to muster is that of professional education. He has always thought that the products of schools of education could become far more effective than they generally are. My view has been that we have many good teachers in spite of schools of education, but that I would never leave the education of my children up to the schools, nor advise anyone to do so who may be concerned about the depth and breadth of their learning. Tug told me shortly after I met him that if this is the case, it is because of people like me, who at the beginning of the twentieth century had an opportunity to take over public education, but didn't want to get their hands dirty. He was right in this also, but my twelve hours of education courses had been more than enough for a lifetime.

At the same time that he has attempted to change the direction of public education, Tug has been a strong supporter of home schooling. Our mutual friend Carl Rosenquist seemed to share this view; when my oldest daughter, born in 1950, was almost of school age, I asked Carl's advice about the best school in Austin, Texas, for her to attend. His reply was, "It's just a shame that you have to send a child like that to school." Later, Tug regularly provided me and my wife with materials on home schooling, including a newsletter by and for parents who were educating

their children at home. I must admit, however, that my children probably would not now be in graduate school in physics and mathematics if they had not attended school.

Tug came to Texas in a position he wanted to use to realize some of his educational ideals: a joint appointment as Professor of Romance Languages and Professor of Education. This sort of thing was not looked upon with favor, I believe, by many specialists in education, languages, or literature. If this is true, and Tug knew it, he never demonstrated any awareness, much less resentment, of it to me. He seems to prefer to ignore the less than attractive characteristics of human beings.

He worked with Joe Michel in the creation of a Foreign Language Education Center where he thought the best of both worlds, education and foreign language teaching, could be brought together. To some extent that has occurred, but I am sure that it has been to a much more limited degree than he had hoped.

Another reason for his effectiveness, I believe, is that in speech as well as in writing, Tug has always expressed himself simply and directly, accurately and elegantly, never taking up any of the many jargons with which he has come into contact. Although he believes fervently in the value of learning other languages, he has never been tempted to turn English into a foreign language, though many of his colleagues seem uncomfortable with simplicity and clarity. This may be in part because he has never forgotten his childhood, nor ceased to learn from his childhood experiences.

In the course of interviewing 25 Latin American novelists, I learned that by far their most important experiences in terms of building a foundation for their creative accomplishments were those of their childhood. This kind of testimony has come from Tug as well, especially in terms of his early bilingualism in Swedish and English, and I believe that the most important message provided both by his words and his life is related to the importance of these early experiences in the creation of the person through the learning of language, spoken and written, personal and official. I know of no greater possible benefit to education, at home as well as at school, than for it to take the direction signaled by Tug Andersson's life and work.

A Student's Perspective

Carol A. Evans
University of Arizona

My own first meeting with Theodore Andersson came as an undergraduate at the University of Texas in 1972. I had first heard of bilingual education in a Spanish class only the previous year, and I was fascinated with the idea. An avid student of Spanish who had sworn loud and long that one thing she would never do was teach, I found myself drawn irresistibly to learn more about the schooling of Mexican American children and the possibilities of this new sort of program. An aunt of mine gave me the name of a man in the Spanish department who could answer my questions. And so I went to see this Theodore Andersson to learn whether there was a place in bilingual education for a person like me. After I explained all these things to the huge professor, he took a book of Spanish prose from his shelf and asked me to read to him. I began, and periodically he would stop me and work on a point of pronunciation. In that hour I learned not to aspirate /p/, /t/, and /k/, for example, and to pronounce the vowels of Spanish without a Texas accent. Somewhat reassured, I guess, Tug sent me to the bilingual program, and there I came under the tutelage of George Blanco.

Years later I returned as a Masters Degree student in bilingual education after teaching for some time in San Antonio. The word was out that Dr. Andersson would be retiring, so we should all take his Bilingual Education Seminar during our first semester. On the first day of class, I remember that one Mexican American classmate introduced herself by saying, "Dr. Andersson, I first met you in Kingsville 6 years ago. When I introduced myself then, I pronounced my name, García, in English. You asked me, 'Is that the way you say it?' We talked about this, and I want you to know that I've pronounced it in Spanish ever since."

A number of us became research assistants in Tug's Preschool Biliteracy Project. Through a Catholic Church in the Mexican American community, he had located families who were interested in helping their children learn to read in Spanish at around age two. Each assistant was assigned to meet weekly with a family, providing support and suggestions. We wrote a weekly report to Tug, and I still remember some of the things I learned from his comments and questions in answer to my observations. Once I commented that Kris, the two-year-old with whose family I was working, "did not know how to play with blocks." Tug offered a gentle counter-possibility that the child had perhaps "not become *interested* in blocks."

The entire group met on Sunday mornings, Tug presiding. He talked mostly to the parents, of course, but he had a remarkable way with the children, too, somehow piquing their curiosity and eliciting responsiveness without ever being intrusive. On one memorable morning, some sort of holiday so that only two families were present, he had brought cupcakes for the children. As he sat cattycorner from a father who held his two-year-old on his lap, cupcake enthroned before her, Tug noticed that she licked her finger before reclaiming a sprinkle that had fallen on the table. Spotting another fallen sprinkle on the table near him, he very methodically pushed it toward her, and then looked up to wait for her response. She looked at him and pushed it back. And so they became engaged in a mesmerizing game that Ragnhild Söderbergh might describe as "protoconversational."

All members of the class were bilingual, and perhaps smugly so. That would not last.

Tug had a habit of introducing his class and research assistants to new bilingual or early literacy research reports written in French or Swedish or Italian. He would talk with great interest about the findings, suddenly stopping to say, "Oh, but you don't read French, do you?" Without another word, he would put the book away.

I took this infuriating piece of bait and began studying French as soon as I finished my Masters Degree. Tug was terribly amused by this and fed me lists of French literature of appropriate difficulty.

Later, when he had retired, he asked me what language I'd rather take up next--Swedish or Italian. I thought Swedish would be fun and so, in one more bit of language teaching, he began to teach me Swedish, his own beloved heritage language, in a rather amazing way. He talked to me first of Selma Lagerlöf, the late nineteenth/early twentieth century writer, and of her Nobel Prize-winning book, Gösta Berlings Saga. Then he began reading that 500-page novel to me, translating and explaining sentence by sentence. Tug showed an uncanny sense of what he needed to explain and what I could figure out on my own. He also had a remarkable ability to get the gist and to translate smoothly and quickly, even when I was fairly certain he did not know some of the individual Swedish words he had just read to me. And sometimes there was pronunciation practice, for Tug has a very keen ear. Though he was never really able to fully de-hispanize my French pronunciation, he was pleased with what he wrought in Swedish. He took great delight that in the case of one Swedish vowel sound usually difficult for English-speaking natives--my Texas rendering of "moon" already provided a close approximation. Gradually I helped with the reading myself. We proceeded through 15 novels in this way, one of us always holding the English translation or Swedish/English dictionary to help us out of troublespots. In the end I had acquired (or learned? I think it was some ideal mixture of the two) a considerable amount of Swedish.

No need thinking Tug would be satisfied with pushing me toward just Swedish and French. During the early years of my doctoral program, when he helped me wriggle my way into some graduate courses in Swedish literature, Tug talked me into taking a German course here and there, and finally, some beginning Italian. One day he was laid up in the hospital, and when I went to see him at lunchtime I made the mistake of mentioning that I had a test in Italian that day. When questioned, I admitted I was not prepared. "Why don't you go to the car and get your book?" he asked. And so he quizzed me from his hospital bed. It is not *his* fault that I made nothing of myself in Italian. Nevertheless, when I think of myself as a very tentative student of Spanish in 1972, I wonder about the series of events that enabled me to become more confidently bilingual in Spanish, and to learn to get along in French and Swedish too.

The story of Tug's impact on me represents in my view one tiny example of the driving force of Tug's work. Offered an opportunity in 1976 by Who's Who in America to name a guiding principle, Tug wrote "Man's search for truth is perhaps his greatest pleasure." For Tug, I think, the pursuit of truth--and the joy of it--is the pursuit of human possibilities--not in some abstract sense, but in real people, in individuals. The job of the language teacher is to use the knowledge of languages and cultures to remove the artificial sorts of limits which cause individuals' possibilities--especially children's possibilities--to be undeveloped, undiscovered, unappreciated.

In closing I paraphrase one of Tug's favorite quotes by Marcel Proust.

> The real voyage consists not in making
> new journeys but in seeing with new eyes.

It is Tug's ability to see and to help us see the potential in language education--in FLES, in bilingual education, in tiny preschool children, and in ourselves as lifelong language learners and teachers--which does not let us be satisfied with where we are, and which urges us to look again and again at the possibilities in ourselves and in our work. This for me is his most lasting and remarkable contribution.

Communication in Interaction During the First 15 Months: A Total Approach

Ragnhild Söderbergh
Lund University

In 1971 Max Gorosch, professor of Spanish and a founder of AILA, advised me to send my recently published monograph Reading in Early Childhood to his colleague in Austin, Texas, Professor Theodore Andersson. My doing so marked the beginning of more than twenty years of collaboration, friendship, and colleagueship carried on mostly by letter, but also in many precious face-to-face encounters. Meeting Theodore Andersson was no simple matter of "exchange of goods and services" in the field of linguistics, literature, and education. It was also a cordial encounter with a human being, one who generously also introduced the new friend into his extensive network of colleagues all over the world. Like him, many of these--especially so his pupils--had also a capacity for collaboration and friendship--not too common in this age of competition.

Asked by Carol Evans to contribute to a volume in his honor, I reread some of his books during my summer holidays on the west coast of Sweden. Returning home I was reached by the sad news of his death, July 28, 1994.

In my last letters to Tug I tried as vividly as possible to give an account of my granddaughter's communicative development and, from 8-1/2 months on, her early reading. What I was learning from her opened up new perspectives that I wanted to share with him. As a tribute to his memory I want to round off this account-- which is still only a beginning--linking it up with a few quotations from his own work. In the following presentation I shall refer to the little girl as N.

> *One can hardly start too early in creating a loving relationship between an infant and other members of the family and in stimulating in the young child a love of books, pictures, games, songs, and other music, in sum, all forms of cultural expression.*[1]

The First Five Months

N was born on May 23, 1993, 26 minutes after midnight. Her father was at the clinic, assisting his wife during her first birth, and the parents received joyfully their strong and healthy daughter. When, 18 hours later, I was allowed to meet my granddaughter for the first time, she was wide awake. I greeted her and began very gently to sing a Danish cradle song, a hymn by Grundtvig:

Sov sødt barnlille,
lig rolig og stille,
så sødelig sov

som fuglen i skov,
som blomstrene blunde i enge.
Gud fader har sagt:
stå engle på vagt,
hvor mine de små er i senge.

(Sleep sweetly little child,
be calm and still,
as sweetly you may sleep
as the bird in the woods,
as the flowers slumber in the meadows.
God our father has said:
stand you angels on guard
where my little ones lay in bed)

She suddenly became completely still, an intent expression of total concentration on her face. The observations by John Lind, late professor at the child clinic of Karolinska Sjukhuset in Stockholm, were confirmed before my eyes: music and song constitute language that even the newborn child will understand, for even the unborn child reacts to it (Lind & Neuman, 1981).

During pregnancy N's mother had often sung to her, and now singing and music would be a most important part of my communication with her, too. By singing I would make her completely calm and often put her to sleep when nothing else worked. On July 13th I noticed that she tried to join in, and two days later I was surprised to find that her two or three tones fit almost exactly into the pattern of the song (cf Trevarthen, 1988).

The little family had the opportunity to spend a long sunny summer holiday--July 1 to August 11-- on the island of Gotland in a cottage surrounded by fragrant pines, 100 meters from the Baltic Sea. I stayed with them all but one week, so the baby received the undivided attention of three adults for almost six weeks. She needed it, because she suffered from colic and slept very little during the daytime: for several hours a day her father had to carry her in an upright position, her back tightly to his chest. She was breastfed as often as she by her "hunger-cries" told her mother that she wanted to eat. During our meals she was with us, lying in her baby-sitter.

Often I took her for long, solitary walks in the pram, gently singing to her a varied repertoire of Swedish and Danish songs. Her mother also sang to her, especially during diaper changing, and then she was rewarded with long protoconversations (Bateson, 1971). By the end of July, N refused to converse with her mother unless she sang to her--their protoconversations were minioperas, where N all the time had a very serious expression on her little face. The rest of the family, however, could talk in a normal way and yet be accepted as conversational partners. In these interactions the child had begun vocalizing very clearly at the end of July, "telling stories" in long chains of sounds. Her smiles had also become broad and deliberate. The protoconversational "mirroring" smile in reaction to adults had been there from her first hours, though nearly always short and quickly passing.

During her long wakeful hours she studied the environment carefully, and we could follow her growing ability closely. Especially interesting was her awakening awareness of my two cats, who always joined us during meals. The first time I saw her looking very intently at the cats was on July 12th; the cats were staring back. Then suddenly, N tried to start a protoconversation with the black she-cat, but when she did not succeed she lost interest in the animal. Two days later she concentratedly looked at first one cat, then at the other. On the same day she also gazed at her mother, following her as she passed by and left the house through the veranda door. When her mother was out of sight, N turned her head in different directions as if to look for her.

In our last week in Gotland, N, two-and-a-half months old, began to grasp at things successfully, and she also deliberately put her fingers in her mouth when she wanted to suck them. During this week I recited a string of animal sounds which I quote here because it was to play an important role in her speech development and reading. The first line was added in mockery by her father, and then included by me into the string.

What does grandmother say?	Rrrrrr
What do the cats Malte and Snurran say?	Mjau, mjau
What does the dog Donna say?	vov vov
What does the cow who is grazing in the meadow say?	Muu muu
What does the sheep say?	Bäää bää
What does the little bird say?	(Whistling imitation of different birds)

In the following I shall refer to the above as "the string."

When the autumn term began, my encounters with N became less frequent, as I worked most of the time in Lund. The string, however, was a constant means of communication, even on the telephone: I talked to her this way for the first time on August 13th, when she was 2 months and 3 weeks old. Her mother noted that N was listening very intently. When I made the sounds of the little bird, she began to smile....

From the middle of August, N started to babble much more when alone. Her protoconversations became shorter and rarer. Her interest shifted over to the environment, and her motoric activities increased: she touched things, kicked and moved her arms much more vehemently, and tried to shuffle. These developments fit very nicely into Trevarthen's scheme (Trevarthen, 1979).

At the beginning of September she became very much interested in her hands. When I visited on the 7th, she did not turn her face toward me, but continued contemplating her right hand, smiling benignantly when I sang one of her favorite songs. Later in the evening, however, we had a very long conversation where she communicated a lot, vocalizing and singing, staring at me intently.

That same month, N's parents began to play CD's to put her to sleep at bedtime. She was very decided about what she wanted to hear. For a period, Leonard Cohen was her favorite, then Gregorian chanting was preferred, and during the spring of 1994, a harp solo was the only effective lullaby. By the end of the month, N's prosody had become varied and melodic. During the same period she also began turning her head to a speaker who called her by name.

When I saw N for a few days at the beginning of October, I played peek-a-boo, hiding my face behind an apron. She liked it very much and laughed heartily. When I stopped, she ordered me to continue by kicking her legs, waving her arms and staring intensely at me. When this did not work she started vocalizing, intermittently.

From October on N also found pleasure in handling things: her rabbit, rattle, and teething-ring. This interest in *things* became evident also in her interactions, in which she suddenly started to grasp for the partner's cheeks and nose.

On October 17th I improvised an interaction play by pretending to be scared when she by chance had made a very long groaning sound. She smiled contentedly, kicked her legs, and then repeated the sound. I reacted in the desired way and the game went on for several rounds.

N's parents thoroughly enjoyed their little daughter and during the first five months she had the benefit of a loving relationship and the stimulation of games, songs, and music. Pictures and books had not yet attracted her attention, but these will appear in the next stage.

> *Burton White believes that most American families do reasonably well in raising their children during the first six to eight months, but he thinks "that perhaps no more than ten percent at most manage to get their children through the eight- to thirty-six-month age period as well educated and developed as they could and should be."*

Beginning to Share

Theodore Andersson's quotation from Burton White (1975) may seem provocative to parents, who surely do not love and care less for their children after they are 6 to 8 months old. White's statement, however, is elucidated by the findings of Colwyn Trevarthen and associates, who in many years of careful study of adult-child interaction have identified a very important change that takes place around the age of 7 to 8 months (Trevarthen and Hubley, 1978). Before this age, during the period he calls "primary intersubjectivity," children strictly keep their investigations of the outside world (including action on things and on their own body) separate from their interaction with human beings. But at the age of 7 to 8 months, the child becomes able to combine these two activities--i.e. to share awareness and knowledge of the outside world with a partner. To do so is to achieve what Trevarthen (1988) calls "secondary intersubjectivity."

Parents who actively observe this development and fully understand the practical implications of this crucial change will be able to make full use of it in their interactions with the child. The gradual appearance of this change in N is seen in the following examples of behavior between 5 1/2 months and 8 months.

On November 10th, I observed N lying on the floor. She had rolled over a couple of times, thus leaving her quilt and reaching the sofa with its wooden carvings. She started to touch them, and then turned around and looked at me. Did she just want to check that I was there, or did she want to see if I was noticing what she was doing, if I was seeing what she was seeing?

On December 21st it was snowing. N and I were sitting by the kitchen window in her home; she was fascinated by the flakes. I suddenly say: "Look! It is snowing!" She turns toward me, then looks back at the big falling flakes of snow.

Later the same afternoon I turn her attention to the lamp in the kitchen, pointing, saying "Titta!" (Look!) and naming the lamp. I do this on several occasions. Sometimes it turns out well and she looks at the lamp, but at times she seems to be so interested in what I am saying that she only looks at me. I then turn on and turn off the light, commenting on my actions.

On January 2nd, 1994, N is visiting me. She turns her head toward my kitchen lamp[2] and I say: "Yes. There is the lamp." When she has turned away from the lamp I ask: "Where is the lamp?" Then she looks at it again.

On January 12 N and I are sitting in her home kitchen. She looks at the lamp several times and each time shares her experience with me.

On January 23 we are back in my home. This time I walk around with N on my arm, turning on the lamps, showing my big clock on the wall, showing a picture of her mother when she was seven years old.

Later that day I observed in the diary, "When N notices something interesting (and I am around) she points to it and/or tries to draw attention to it by means of her voice. She then looks at me, listening to my comments, following my pointings and demonstrations. In this way we share the lamp, the clock, Mummy, Daddy, the cats Malte and Snurran. But if *I* take the initiative by asking, "Where is the lamp?" she does not look at it. She must have the initiative if this interaction of secondary intersubjectivity is to take place."

But when I asked for the lamp in the hall in her own home two days later, N looked at the ceiling. I then said I was going to turn it on. She observed intently. Here we have an elucidating example of what Jerome Bruner (1983) has called "the original word game." The game is made possible by the fact that the child developmentally has reached a stage where it can combine interest in the environment and interaction with a partner--in which interaction the child can also listen to the words of the partner and match them with reality, thus arriving at an understanding of the meanings of the words.

We also learn an important lesson: In this game the child wants to have the initiative, first demonstrating interest in the thing which is going to be the topic of interaction. Occasionally the adult may have the initiative, but only occasionally. Put in the words of Theodore Andersson (1981:53),

> The child learns only what he is interested in, and the successful teacher is the one who can read, and respond imaginatively to, the interests of the child.

Let us keep this in mind when showing how pictures, books, and written words may become the topics of interaction even during the second half of the first year of life.

> *Many parents have discovered children's early attraction to letters, words, and books, and are learning how to respond.*

Pictures and Books as a Topic of Interaction

On November 21 when N was just on the verge of developing into secondary intersubjectivity, I wrote the following: "N is looking very attentively at Astrid (her mother) when she goes to the bookcase, takes down a book and turns the pages, reading." And on January 12th, when secondary subjectivity is a fact, her father Bo "is walking around in the sitting room, following the bookcases, carrying N. She comments by saying ä-dä, ä-dä (emerging repetitive babbling) and Bo confirms and talks about the books, pointing to their backs."

In the research of the last 10 years, much has been written about how children "become literate" during the preschool years by simply taking part in the activities of a literate environment. Carol Evans (1988) has pointed out that what is characterized in this research is very often literacy in a weak sense of the word: an awareness of print and books, an exposure to bedtime stories, a pointing to and scribbling of letters that prepares the child for the teaching or reading and writing in school. Only some, e.g. Dolores Durkin (1966), and Kenneth and Yetta Goodman (1976), have not shied way from speaking of literacy in the "strong" sense--that of really becoming able to read and write. In Chapters 2 and 3 of his Guide, Andersson (1981) has given a highly interesting account of relatively recent evidences of early reading in the strong sense, where the earliest start has been reported by Danny and Miho Steinberg (1975) in "Reading Before Speaking." Their son was exposed to letters from the age of six months and to words and phrases from ten months (i.e., after the stage of secondary intersubjectivity had been attained.)

In the case of N, an exposure that would lead to literacy in the weak sense of the word is documented for the first time in the two book-related incidents given above. In this section I will show how this exposure is reinforced not only by presenting pictures and picture books to the girl, *but also by using "the original word game"* in a game of reading cards. The game is based on the child's growing understanding of the meanings of words and on her own experiences, interests, and world knowledge. Many of the experiences have been shared with the adult partner who plays the reading game.

Like the Steinberg child, N has begun reading before speaking. In the following paragraphs I am able to show how this reading, in which the adult says the words aloud for the child, will not only reinforce her comprehension of vocabulary and add new items to it, but will also serve as a bridge to speech and communication through sounds, gestures, and words. Reading will help the child to an active use of the spoken words or their equivalents in sign and sound where an approximate articulation of the word is as yet too difficult.

When N, on her father's arm, was "commenting" on the backs of books on the shelves, she had already for a couple of weeks been handling two of her own first books. They were made of plastic-coated cardboard, and thus able to stand the attacks of a 7 to 8 month old baby. In this way she learned how to handle books, to turn the pages. She also began to scrutinize the pictures, and as she pointed to and touched details, we pointed to and named them. At the end of January we noticed that she looked with great interest at the photos of several people she knows. For Christmas the family had received a photo of a boy, three days younger than N, and his nine-year-old sister, the children of colleagues of N's parents, living in the same block. Her keen interest in this photo, as well as her interest in and fondness for a photo of her mother, brought us to the conclusion that she was able to identify them. At the end of January, her interst in her books grew remarkably; she could sit for more than 10 minutes turning pages, looking.

On February 5 she sat with her book Dags att äta (Time to eat), turning the pages, touching the pictures and *whispering to herself "Titta" (Look).* (The fact that titta was her first protoword could be ascribed to "the original word game," with its recurring "Titta" accompanied by pointing.)

At the beginning of February I decided to see whether in addition to the pictures, words might be introduced as objects of interaction. N's mother, herself being an early reader, was very keen on this reading project, and her father, taking an active part in the interactions with N, took a positive attitude.

> *The average parent. . . has a tendency to sell young children short, especially when told by school representatives that children are not ready to read before attaining a mental age of six and a half. By observing their own children closely, by responding fully to their questions, and by surrounding them with interesting materials and activities, parents can learn something of their children's potential and refrain from inhibiting their learning by limiting their expectations.*

Presenting Reading Cards

The first six cards, and the problem of checking reading before speech. On February 5th, at 8 1/2 months old, N got her first reading card. She was standing on my knees, reaching toward the light in the ceiling. I presented her with lampa written on a card in lower-case letters. I put her down on my knees, showing the card. N looked at it eagerly, took the card, turned it around. Seeing that the back was blank, she turned it back again, looked at the word, and vocalized. I took the card and held it at a distance. She emitted little eager sounds, now and then turning her head upwards, looking at the light on the ceiling, then back to the card that is now passing between us; she is turning it, rolling it, wrinkling it. I smooth it out again.

On the next day she got three more cards: "mamma," "pappa," "Malte," (one of my cats: both are her favorites). A week later "lampa", "mamma," and "pappa" were worn out, so I had to write new cards. N was watching, emitting her little eager sounds and waving her arms. On February 16th when I am showing her the cards again, reading them aloud, she *repeats "pappa" after me.* Later, when N's father is sitting on the sofa, I show the card "pappa" to her. *N first looks at the card, then at her father.* As for "mamma," she repeats my reading of it about a month later, on March 13; three days later she reads it all by herself for the first time. On March 28 she also reads "pappa." Sure evidence that she is able to identify "Malte" is given on July 19th: When I present the card, she points to a photo of Malte that happens to be around. Similar evidence is given later for the word "lampan" (in the definite form, substituted for the original "lampa.")

So in the examples above N has demonstrated her increasing ability to read the four words by (1) imitative reading aloud (2) pointing or looking at a referent or a picture representing the referent, and (3) spontaneously reading aloud.

Making a traditional evaluation we would say that the three ways of behaving represent three stages with (1) at the bottom and (3) at the top. This would, however, be a great mistake,

as here the reader is not yet a speaker. The reason why the word "pappa," but not any of the other words, is repeated already on the second day of presentation is the fact that the girl has complete control only of a few babbling sounds, among which are /ba ba/pa pa/. So she first exploits this ability in reading pappa after me. Not until one month later is she able to do this with "mamma." Later that month her new vocal ability is made use of in *spontaneously reading both words aloud.* As for "lampan" and "Malte," she always remains silent when I present these words; her babbling repertoire does not allow for any imitative reading of "Malte." Finally, by referring to the photo of Malte, she demonstrates that she has identified this word.

In the following account of the next 34 words presented to the girl, I will analyze her reading according to three categories: (1) imitative reading aloud (2) silent identification (by pointing to the referent or by handing over/pointing to the reading card at request), and (3) independent reading (vocally or occasionally by gesture).

On February 26th, N is presented with "mormor" (maternal grandmother), and on March 13 with "N" (her own name). The diary reports that she often shows joy at seeing these cards. On May 14th, after independently reading "mamma" and "pappa," the sight of "mormor" and her own name inspire much babbling. On June 29th she is reading "mormor" independently (without the final r-sounds). The reading of her own name on August 12th is relatively late--she never uses it in her own speech. On August 7th, however, I play a little game where I let two dolls cry and call her name in shrill voices. Trying to make me repeat the game, she gives the two dolls to me, imitating their calling of her name: /ne ne/. Five days later she uses this speech form in an independent reading of the card "N."

On March 13th I also give N a blank reading card. After a quick look at it she lets it drop on the floor....

Sharing New Experiences: The Child in Command. During the first months of reading, the pointing and naming routines were extended to many new objects. Eight days after we had begun, N wanted to share a host of things in her home: in the kitchen a plant hanging in front of the window (very soon my blowing on that plant to make the leaves move became part of the routine), a plate decorated with fruit, three magnetic cats (you had always to count "one, two, three") and two photos of the kids Julia and Ludwig (Ludde) on the refrigerator, the lamp, a map of France, etc.; in the hall a little wooden cupboard, a picture of three children, a key; in her own room different pictures and a row of toy animals, etc. on her shelves, and last but not least a sculptured angel hanging in the window, horizontally suspended on two strings, swinging. These things we had to mention many times daily, guided by her imperious little forefinger and by her requesting looks. New items were added as time passed by. In my home one of the most important objects apart from the two cats was a pendulum clock, striking every half hour.

Particularly important were the long excursions in the pram during spring and summer. On April 23 I took her out for her first long walk in a neighboring wood. It was amazing to see her keen interest in everything. New pointing and naming routines developed, and as she made me much more sensitive to everything around, I especially drew her attention to trees, flowers, and birds, naming them, letting her smell and touch flowers and grass, imitating the birds. This interest later showed up in her fondness of two books, a book of birds and a book of flowers. During the spring and summer the paternal grandparents and their dog, their big house with its garden and swing, would give new experiences and provide new topics for interaction and talk.

In the outdoor interactions I observed the same untiring repetitiveness: every single lamp post in the avenue of Karlavägen must be commented on, not a single dove, duck, jackdaw, sparrow, wagtail, or seagull was left without attention; the fifteenth jogger was as interesting as the first one; and I have never before noticed how many people are walking their dogs in the parks of Stockholm.

From April 8th, I observed that she began to make reference to previously unknown things, pointing and saying "Titta!" I consider this as a first evidence of an emerging heuristic function (Halliday, 1977), where the child wants to know something, and turns to the adult for information: "What is this and what is it called?"

Reading 32 more cards. On March 3, ten more reading cards were written and shown: "farmor" and "farfar" (paternal grandmother/grandfather), "Donna" (their dog), "Julia" and "Ludde" (children, cf. above), "Snurran" (my second cat), "klockan" (the watch/clock, cf above), "ängeln" (the angel, cf above).

When presented with "farmor," N at first looked surprised, then she regarded the card very attentively, and finally a smile lit up her face. When I showed her "farfar," reading it aloud, she took a long and thoughtful look at the card, *imitating: /fa fa/. This was the first time she had ever said that word*, and from that day on she always said it as soon as we were talking about her grandparents. On the following day, she also repeated her imitative reading of "farfar." Three months later (July 6th), she made her first independent reading of the word, and from June 29th, "farmor" made company--but always read as "farfar," for she also referred to her maternal grandmother as /fa fa/.

The next word to be read independently was "ängeln": During the second half of April, N repeatedly "read" the card by making a swinging movement with her right hand. I then remembered that I had made a similar gesture when talking about the angel, to remind N that the angel was swinging back and forth in the window. On May 5th, however, she began representing the word by rocking (the upper part of her body) back and forth. "Julia" was very suddenly actively read on June 29th as /lu:la/. She had for some days been saying /li:la/, in imitation of "lilja" (lily), (said by her father in play around a lily), and in imitation of "lila" (the color lilac) a word we have read to her in two of her favorite books. Thus she now tried another l+vowel combination, exchanging /li:/ in /li:la/ for /lu:/, saying /lu:la/. "Donna" was read independently on July 27 by means of "vov vov," the barking sound from the string of animal sounds. An ability to identify the reading card "Snurran" and "klockan" was demonstrated on July 27th.

The delay in reading "klockan," independently is a bit confusing, as she had used the word /koka/ after a few day's visit to relatives in Bohuslän, where a big clock played an important role in her interactions. Perhaps the reading card was too tightly linked up with my clock to allow her to use the spoken word which emerged in reference to a different clock. Also, from July 19th, she addressed Snurran with an /em:/, i.e., the "mew" sound corresponding to Swedish "jam" or "mjau." (Cf the "vov vov" used when reading Donna.)

The card for "Ludde" was totally neglected after the more correct "Ludwig" had been presented. Neither "hunden" not "katten" are reacted to in any way. A reason may be, that in the beginning they did not get separate cards, "hunden" being written on back of the "Donna" card, and "katten" on back of "Malte." Moreover, the more general words may lack interest when there are representatives with individual names.

On May first I presented N with the card "Astrid" and "Bo," the names of her parents. *For the first time I observe her taking cards and pointing at different letters.* On May 10th she imitates me reading "Bo" independently, and identifies "Astrid," which she reads independently on August 12th as /atä/.

On May 10th N receives the names of her grandparents, "Ann-Charlotte," "Gunnar," "Ragnhild." She never tries to read any of these. Probably she has not heard her grandparents referred to by their given names often enough. (As for her parents, she hears them call each other by their names daily.)

On June 6th seven more words were presented, all representing animal sounds which she used in her speech. "Mjau," "vov vov," "bää," and "muu" were part of "the string" and had been reinforced by book-reading and talking about the cats and dog in her environment. The owl sound "uuu" was one of her favorites. She had first met it in a book, and then used it to design owls on pictures in other books. Later acquisitions were "ka ka ka ka" for the hen, and "kra kra kra" for the crow, which she had learned during our walks when we imitated birds we met. "Vov vov" and "bää" she read independently already the next day, and all the others, except "muu" on July 27th. "Mjau" was read /äm/, probably under the influence of a book that she listened to very often, Kattresan by Ivar Arosenius, where the cat says "jam" (cf above).

In June, N and her parents stayed for a week with friends in Bohuslän (Yngve and Ulla), where she saw a lot of flowers and birds which she tried to imitate. Then they visited France for a week. During this period she learned to say "Skål!" /ka:/, raising her right hand (with or without her bottle or a mug in it.) She also took a fancy to some pictures in a book about Cézanne. In one of them a man was smoking a pipe. Two favorite picture books had names of colors, and two had "nalle" (Teddy) as their hero. Another favorite word was "and" (wild duck), as she had met a lot of ducks at sea and also in books, in pictures, and as toys. So on July 17th, when returning from my holidays, I gave her the following cards to read: "Ulla," "Yngve," "skål," "pipa" (pipa), "nalle," "gul" (yellow), "and," and "lila." When her parents turned up, we showed the cards to them, and they read them aloud, showing great interest. N read "skål" with me, adding the characteristic gesture. She also attempted an independent reading of "pipa," saying "pappa!" This was her first misidentifiation of a new word owing to formal similarity with an earlier learned word (cf. Söderbergh, 1971;1977). Looking at "Yngve," she nodded cheerfully, as if meeting an old friend. She scrutinized the two cards "nalle" and "Ulla," looking from one to the other several times.

Four days later I gave her "hej" (hello), as she had begun to use this word. She identified pages where this word was written in two books that we frequently read to her. On July 27th, she identified "hej," "Ulla," "and," and "skål," though she did not read them independently.

On July 21, N's mother made an interesting observation. N was sitting with a book called Lukas i fönstret (Lukas in the window), looking at the title page. Suddenly she pointed to "ka" in "Luka," saying "ka ka ka ka," the hen sound earlier presented on a reading card.

On July 27th I made a check of N's ability to identify the words, showing all 38 cards quickly and without pressure. When she reached the limit of her ability to say the words aloud, I spread the cards on the floor, asking her for those she had not read to me. She answered by pointing to or by giving me some of the cards I asked for.

A Summary of Results. Summing up the result of N's first six months of reading, from 8 1/2 to 14 1/2 months of age, we see that out of 38 words presented during the period from

February 5th to July 21st, she independently reads 16 (one by gesture, and two by using a "synonym," e.g., "vov vov for "Donna"), and identifies another nine by picking the corresponding cards out on request. Of the remaining 13 cards, where no evidence of recognition is given, 5 have been presented as late as the second half of July, 7 are first names, already discussed above. A reading vocabulary of 25 words is no little achievement in a little girl of less than 15 months whose active communicative vocabulary in gestures, sounds, and words can be estimated at 45-50 items.

Especially interesting are the instances *where a reading card is a support in the acquisition of an active speech vocabulary (pappa, mamma, farfar, Julia)* or *elicits a communicative gesture (ängeln)*. Another surprising finding is *the early interest in analyzing the written words*, e.g., comparing "nalle" and "Ulla," and finding "ka" in "Lukas." As the words appear in written form they become "objectified" and may be scrutinized like things in the real world, and like pictures. Thus we see the embryo of a metalinguistic awareness in a child 14 months old.

Towards Building a Text. N has just started to use her first two-item combinations in communication, e.g., "dä brm" (there car). She also combines two items when using building blocks, and she counts to three. She shows an interest in Chinese boxes, where in a series of five, one is contained in the other. So I had the idea that perhaps she would appreciate a combination of reading cards.

Earlier this summer she had received a beautiful blue dress from a friend of mine, accompanied by a short letter, where a few key words had been framed, and corresponding reading cards and picture cards had been added. Among the cards were "klänning" (dress) and "blå" (blue). I read the letter to N and presented the cards and illustrations. N pointed again and again at the framed words and wanted me to read them. So one day (August 13th) when her little family had planned a visit, I told her that she and her mother and father were going to visit grandmother and grandfather and the dog, and that she was going to have her blue dress on. I hung the dress over the bedstead. Then I took nine reading cards, placing them in the following order: "mamma Astrid pappa Bo N farmor farfar Donna vov vov." Afterwards I read the message, adding the necessary words, but pointing at the reading cards as I read them. N then fetched the two reading cards "klänning" (dress) and "blå" (blue) and gave them to me. *In this way she took an active part in building a text, based on reading cards that she knew.*

From Listening to a Bird's Song to Reading His Name. I will finish this account with a few intersting notes from the last two weeks. I have already mentioned how I specially reinforced N's attention to birds. A bird was referred to in the string already, where the sound of the bird, even on the telephone, made her smile as early as August 13th. So during our walks in spring I lifted my finger, saying "Listen!" so as to draw her attention to the sounds developed into onomatopoetic words used when referring to the birds (kra kra for crow, ko ko for cuckoo, etc.) Interestingly, she also adopted my gesture and used it when referring to all sorts of sounds for which the origin could not be seen: a raised finger would mark the sound of a helicopter or far away traffic, for example.

At the end of July she found a book about birds, each bird with its own picture and name and a lot of facts. This book became a favorite. At first she concentrated on the cuckoo, the owls, the crow, and the seagull, referring to them by making the corresponding sounds. I

confirmed what she said, gave real names, and drew her attention to the characteristics of the birds. A day later she wanted to see all the birds. She stopped for a long time at each page, pointing to the pictures again and again, each time in a different order, making it really difficult for me always to say the right name. In this way she systematically went through the book day after day, attentively listening and looking at me as I said the names. So she learned to say the new words "ärla" /ä:la/ (wagtail), and "örn" /ö:n/ (eagle). Later whe identified a wagtail in a primer she was looking at with her father's mother. Her grannie, who had named the animal "bird," was astounded to hear N say "ärla." Finally, on getting the reading card "gök" (cuckoo), she anticipated my reading and immediately said "ko ko." So evidently she had been able to pick out and learn the word from the book when we were reading it together.

Here we see a very clear example of how a growing child is actively taking in language in joyful interaction with partners. The language is offered first without meaning, as rhythm, melody, and form during the earliest months; then it is offered with direct reference to her real life experience, and to her viewing of pictures, books, and written words. Reality and its symbolic representation in pictures, spoken words, and written words are closely knit together in a web jointly constructed by adult and child, where the adult has the lead, but the child little by little will take over. We are reminded of Vygotsky's words: "What a child can do with assistance today she will be able to do by herself tomorrow" (1978:87).

Conclusion

Contributing to a book that should be devoted to bilingualism, I am happy to tell that recently N was pointing to a picture of a baby, saying "bébé." Nobody had used this word with her since her visit to France six weeks earlier. So hopefully this little girl will not be encapsulated in a monocultural (and monolingual) shell, because "nothing is more difficult than to break out of a monocultural shell" (Andersson, 1969:160).

Theodore Andersson passionately advocated the early education of children in the home: "the home is the best school because it is the most informal" and because "each person in the family represents a potential resource" (1981, 53f). He often praised family closeness and loving interaction, but also insisted on a deep respect for the child as an individual:

> Right from birth a child is in some sense an independent human being with an almost infinite potential for growth and development. The successful parent-teacher, therefore, is the one who refrains from imposing his/her own will on a child but rather tries to understand the child's efforts to grow, learn, and control the environment (1981, 56f).

But in all his concern for the child, he did not forget the integrity of the adult, and the adult's duties and needs. "It may sound to some as if 'teaching' is a full-time job. It *is* time-consuming, but it should not be a full-time occupation, for, not only do parents have their own lives to live, but they also must serve as worthy models for their children" (57).

Above all, he believed that such education should be a source of satisfaction and joy for both adult and child. Much more important than the child's native ability in determining the ultimate success of such effort was the adult's capacity to appreciate and honor the child's possibilities.

> No outstanding teacher can falter in his overriding belief in the infinite worth and potentiality of the children committed to his care--if only for fifteen minutes a day. With this essential faith in human dignity anything is possible. Without it the teacher greatly reduces the goals, and limits the achievement of his pupils. This does not mean, of course, that each student challenged by such faith will achieve superiority, but it does mean that he will be inspired to achieve something near his maximum achievement. And the teacher imbued with this respect for human worth will gain as much satisfaction from a modest achievement as from a superior performance, if it represents a pupil's best efforts.

Great teacher that he was, he encouraged us to learn from the children themselves. To teach, as he envisioned it, after all, is not only to experience close at hand the human potential for language and for learning, but also to celebrate one's very humanity.

References

Andersson, T. (1969). Foreign languages in the elementary school: A struggle against mediocrity. University of Texas Press.

Andersson, T. (1981). A guide to family reading in two languages: The preschool years. National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education.

Bateson, M. (1979). The epigenesis of conversational interaction: A personal account of reserach. In M. Bullowa (Ed.) Before speech. Cambridge University Press.

Bruner, J. (1983). Child's talk: Learning to use language. New York: W.W. Norton & Company.

Durkin, D. (1966). Children who read early: two longitudinal studies. Teachers College Press.

Evans, C. (1988). Two notions of preschool literacy. In Early reading and writing. Child Language Research Institute, Paper 3, Lund University, Department of Linguistics.

Goodman, K., & Gooodman, Y. (1976). Learning to read is natural. Paper presented at Conference on Theory and Practice of Beginning Reading Instruction, Pittsburgh, April 13, 1976.

Halliday, M. (1977). Learning how to mean: Explorations in the development of language. Edward Arnold.

Lind, J. & Neuman, S. (1981). Musik i livets början (Music at the beginning of life). Akademilitteratur/Rädda Barnen.

Steinberg, D. & Steinberg, M. (1975). Reading before speaking.

Visible Language, 9:3. 1975.

Söderbergh, R. (1977). Reading in early childhood: A linguistic study of a preschool child's gradual acquisition of reading ability. Georgetown University Press 1977 (Reprint of an earlier edition, Almqvist & Wiksell, 1971).

Söderbergh, R. (1976). Learning to read: Breaking the code or acquiring functional literacy? and Learning to read between two and five: Some observations on normal hearing and deaf children. In: Georgetown University Papers on Language and Linguistics, No 13: Early reading, edited by Robert Lado and Theodore Andersson. Georgetown University Press.

Söderbergh, R. (1981). Teaching deaf preschool children to read in Sweden. In: P. Dale and D. Ingram (Eds.), Child language: An international perspective. University Park Press.

Söderbergh, R. (1982). Early reading as language acquisition. System, 9, 3, 207-213.

Söderbergh, R. (1986). Acquisition of spoken and written language in early childhood. In I. Kurcz, G. W. Shugar & J. H. Danks (Eds.), Knowledge and language. North-Holland.

Söderbergh, R. (1990). Semiotic play: A child translates text into pictures. In Working Papers, No. 36. Lund University, Department of Linguistics.

Söderbergh, R. (1991). Från berättelse till bild: en femåring läser och tecknar. (From Narrative to Picture: A Five-year-old girl reads and draws). Centrum för Barnkulturforskning (Center of Childhood Education) nr 16. Stockholms Universitet.

Söderbergh, R. (1993). Tidig läsning och skrivning som stöd för tvåspråkighet. (Early reading and writing as an aid to bilingualism). In: Elisabeth Hansen (Ed.) The Fourth Nordic Child Language Symposium, Copenhagen, November 13th-15th 1992. Institute of Early Childhood Education. Royal Danish School of Educational Studies, Copenhagen.

Trevarthen, C. (1979). Communication and cooperation in early infancy: A description of primary intersubjectivity. In M. Bullowa (Ed.), Before speech. Cambridge University Press.

Trevarthen, C. (1988). Infants trying to talk: How a child invites communication from the human world. In R. Söderbergh (Ed.), Children's creative communication. Lund University Press.

Trevarthen, C.& Hubley, P. (1978). Secondary intersubjectivity: confidence, confiding and acts of meaning in the first year. In A. Lock (Ed.), Action, gesture, and symbol. Academic Press.

White, B. (1975). The first three years of life. Edgewood Cliffs, N.J. Prentice-Hall.

Vygotsky, L. (1978). Mind in society. In M. Cole, V. John-Steiner, S. Schribner and E. Soubermann (Eds), Mind in society. Harvard University Press.

1.Each of the epigraphs is cited from Andersson (1981). The exact page references are as follows: The first epigragh, appearing on page 59, (48); the second epigragh, appearing on page 63, (47); the third, on page 65, (56); the fourth, on page 68, (50).

2. In order to parallel the Swedish usage of the word "lampa," the English word "lamp" is used here to refer to ceiling light fixtures as well as to the freestanding lighting devices we normally refer to by this name.

Challenging Language Prospects: - A View of the Scholarly Work of Theodore Andersson

Carol A. Evans
The University of Arizona

Theodore Andersson, known to his wide circle of friends as "Tug,"[1] worked throughout his career for the implementation of new language programs. His accomplishments in the teaching of languages cover four areas: (1) the development and leadership of university departments of Romance languages, (2) the conception and promotion of FLES programs (foreign languages in the elementary school), (3) the envisioning and pioneering bilingual education in the United States as we know it today, and (4) the articulation of the potential of preschool biliteracy as the beginning of a truly bilingual education.

So easily discriminable are these four accomplishments, differing markedly both in the age of student which Tug held in focus and the specific language program he sought to promote, that they may give a sense of disjointed and essentially unrelated efforts. In fact, as I hope to demonstrate, the nontraditional language teaching perspective which has characterized each phase of Tug's work has grown out of a single core of ideas. These ideas originated from a special set of childhood language experiences through which he acquired and maintained bilingualism early and without the assistance of language teachers or schools. The ideas that seem paramount, both animating and unifying the four regions of his achievement, are these: first, the intrinsic value of bilingualism for human development and for intercultural understanding; second, the advantage of learning a second language early and within the cultural context that corresponds to the language; and third, the importance of a language teacher who is at once captivating, knowledgeable, and responsive. Following a discussion of the three ideas, I will describe their relationship to one or more of the four areas of achievement.

The Intrinsic Value of Knowing Other Languages Well

In 1970, just after the completion of Bilingual Schooling, in an interview for the Austin American-Statesman, Tug recalled a 1957 conversation with Harry Ransom, who was in New York City to recruit him to the University of Texas. Tug told him, "I want to go where I have scope for my missionary drive--there is none at Yale." Ransom asked him what the drive was. "To push the importance of teaching second languages early in the school years" (Warren, 1970).

This is a remarkable and revealing statement in several senses, even if we set aside for a later moment the emphasis on the early schooling years. First, the role of missionary is hardly a conventional one for a university professor. In the particular case of professors of Romance languages, the preparation of scholarly evidence and arguments for debate among colleagues suggests research and scholarship rather than missionary zeal. Passion is normally reserved for defense of one's intellectual positions. Second, the commitment to *push* the teaching of languages is almost as antithetical to the usual posture of language department professors as missionary zeal itself. University department reputations, as a Yale Ph.D. in Spanish would know better than most, are built on the publications of their faculty and on the prestige attained by graduates of

their doctoral programs; the teaching of languages themselves ranks sufficiently low in priority that much of the responsibility is assigned to graduate assistants and non-tenured staff. Perhaps most remarkable about the statement, however, is the eagerness of a language professor to enter the fray of pre-university schooling. Except through foundation grant program incentives, university departments outside colleges of education have traditionally found little inspiration for working with public school systems; attempts to influence high school education have usually been restricted to the raising of university entrance requirements.

Chester Christian mentions a conversation in which Tug made plain his feeling that this detachment of academy members, this reluctance to "get their hands dirty" over public education, was a serious mistake. If the best trained minds of a generation refused to become involved in the shaping of public education, then the mediocre schooling of subsequent generations could hardly be a surprise.

So strong was his conviction about the need to work with schools in 1957 that he was not only willing to forego his comfortable tenured position at Yale, but also *unwilling* to accept any position which would similarly confine his efforts to the halls of universities. Nevertheless, it seems clear that he hoped to effect change not only in the public schools, but in university language departments as well.

But what underlay this commitment to "push" the teaching of languages? What value in Tug's view did the learning of languages offer? The answer to this question is not to be found in a single writing, but seems to develop in stages over the course of Tug's career, as the language professor superbly educated in great literary works increasingly came to be interested in children's ability to acquire languages outside of school.

Indeed, though nearly every work included significant and often stirring statements about the value of language, Tug's writing usually focused much less on explaining why languages were important than on what to *do* to improve language learning.

Given that Tug was so often pressing for preparing more and better language teachers, in fact--secondary modern language teachers, FLES teachers, bilingual education teachers, and parent teachers--one sometimes has the erroneous feeling of a kind of circularity in his thinking: the teaching of languages is important because it produces language teachers. What is crystal clear when one reads the work as a whole and what will be clear from the citations from Tug's work throughout the rest of this paper is that Tug's work has always concentrated on people, not on the languages themselves. Linguistic resources for Tug are human resources, just as linguistic potential is human potential. What languages provide humans is one avenue for developing beyond their present selves--for liberating individuals from the limits of their immediate surroundings and for improving their societies through richer inter- and intracultural understanding. This is for Tug what is important about learning languages, and this is why, in his view, we must teach them everywhere, and well.

When Tug first began publishing about the teaching of languages in 1952, he did so with a sense of urgency. His focus at this point was on the usefulness of languages to society as a whole rather than on individual development. In a review of the work of the 1952 Yale-Barnard Conference on the Teaching of French,[2] lamenting that "modern foreign languages...have reached such a lowpoint in this country," he wrote

> Not until we begin to prepare a generation of Americans who can really speak at least one foreign language well shall we begin to banish our linguistic isolationism and prepare the huge linguistic reserves from which we may find an adequate number of international leaders to represent America worthily in a community of peace-seeking nations (1952:128).

The specter of World War II was still fresh, with its new revelation of man's great potential for destructiveness. The beginning of the Cold War had followed, threatening further realizations of that potential. During this period, Tug lobbied constantly for more and better language education, and making two points again and again: First, improved knowledge of languages was an essential part of the quest for world peace, and second, linguistic isolationism was inconsistent with responsible world leadership (1953b; 1953c). Suddenly Tug seemed to be everywhere--speaking, writing, and organizing conferences at many levels.[3] He sought the ear not only of language teachers, but of general educational organizations themselves. The following call for active cooperation among educators and across language specialists is taken from an article in School and Society, voice of the Society for the Advancement of Education, Inc.:

> We are in fact suffering in the language field from our besetting weakness of isolationism. Languages have as yet no representation in the National Education Association, through such representation is long overdue. Language teachers, psychologists, and linguistic scientists have operated in separate camps, though each camp can stand to profit from a better knowledge of what the other is doing and all would benefit enormously from working together. The classical languages and the modern languages have not always felt that they had interests in common. And the separate modern language groups have sometimes promoted their own languages a little too exclusively. While contributing more and more vigorously to international co-operation, we should do everything possible to set our own local, regional, and national communities and organizations in order (1953d:409).

A number of Tug's activities surrounded his directing the UNESCO Seminar of the Teaching of Modern Languages which took place in Nuwara, Eliya, Ceylon (now Sri Lanka) in August, 1953. The seminar was commissioned at the fifth general session of UNESCO in Florence in 1950 to explore "the teaching of modern languages and its contribution to the promotion of international understanding" (1953d:408). The goal was to provide "the basic materials for a publication embodying a synthesis of the experience available in modern language teaching as well as practical suggestions for improving the contribution which this teaching can make to education for living in a world community" (408). Eighteen member states sent between one and three representatives. Most were linguists; many were suspicious not only of each other, but especially of the American language professor in charge. Tug was undaunted. When his proposal for a regular session on FLES was not allowed as part of the regular seminar, he simply scheduled an extra evening presentation. His paper, titled "The Teaching of Foreign Languages

in the Elementary Schools in the United States of America" created so much controversy that Félix Walter of the Secretariat of UNESCO elected to include it in the summary volume of studies from the conference. He and Tug jointly edited the collection, entitled The Teaching of Modern Languages (1955).

These experiences, and also a year of work at the State Department immediately after World War II, fed Tug's view of languages as necessary for a peace-seeking world. His view was far from the prevailing one, however; and very few voices were complaining about the country's linguistic shortsightedness. In his 1954 study for UNESCO William Riley Parker compared the offerings in modern languages in the public schools of 35 countries. Parker found that the United States ranked near the bottom in almost all categories, including age at which a second language is begun (1955). This was particularly puzzling, given that the War had found the country so unprepared for its sudden needs to communicate with non-English-speakers that a $40,000,000 crash program was put together in order to train speakers speedily in the various necessary languages (1971). The result of this defense effort was a costly and belated but very successful intensive language training program, the product of collaboration between language teachers, linguists, and psychologists.

Although modern languages were taught before World War II, the emphasis was, as with the teach of Latin, not on the development of speaking ability, but on grammar as used in the translation of texts. After the war, in spite of success of the new program, university and high school programs for the most part picked up their pre-war approaches to language teaching. Of as much concern to Tug as the fact that these programs would produce another generation of non-speakers of foreign languages was the fact that they also would fail to produce anyone who could teach differently in the future. Speaking at the Conference on the Role of Foreign Languages in American Schools in Washington, D.C., he described elements of the knowledge which foreign language teachers must possess (1953b). His description stresses the importance of culture in language learning and also identifies as a crucial element an effort "to become more like" those people who speak the language natively. Gardner and Lambert (1972) would later term this approach to language learning an "integrative" motivation. Tug wrote

> ...languages...are not just another textbook subject, but involve, in addition to the usual understanding, a very complex set of skills, which may be compared with those in the fields of art or music. To know a language does not mean only to be able to decipher a written text, or even to write a translation from the foreign language into English, but it involves the ability to think and t feel in that foreign language much as the native speaker thinks and feels in it. This obviously includes a pronunciation of the language which is approximately that of a native speaker. Most important of all, however, it means assuming something of the personality of the foreigner whose language is being used. Clearly, our present system of language instruction, which consists of two or sometimes three or rarely four years of academic instruction is woefully inadequate (1).

A great deal of his attention, in fact, was focused of necessity on improving the preparation of teachers. In 1951 he had launched the Master of Arts in Teaching program at Yale, "a five-year plan for the preparation of a few highly qualified teachers for the secondary school

in various fields" (1953b:2). Having begun to lobby already for FLES programs, he had immediately secured Yale's agreement to a special expansion for preparing foreign language teachers for elementary schools. By 1953 he had also incorporated a component for the preparation of secondary teachers of modern languages. Of these efforts he wrote,

> Obviously we cannot hope to produce only perfectly qualified teachers, but we can carry in mind constantly the conception of an ideally qualified teacher and thus more successfully approximate this ideal in our practical everyday work of teacher education....(1953b:2)

His reason for urgently promoting improved preparation of language teachers, like that for promoting language learning itself, was the development of children's potential for the benefit of society at large:

> Our very survival as a free nation depends upon our restudying constantly the fundamental bases of our education and rededicating ourselves to the task of encouraging our children to grow to the full extent of their human capacities and to become articulate citizens and leaders on the international scene (1953b: 2-3)

In "Faces of Language," eleven years later, Tug's description of the value of modern languages reflected a similar focus on the nation's need for a language-sophisticated citizenry. This continued focus on the needs of the country is perhaps explained by the fact that the tenseness of the Cold War had heightened in the late 50's and early 60's. Because the USSR's successful launch of the world's first artificial satellite had so completely taken this country by surprise, the improvement of American public education itself had come to be viewed as essential for the country's defense and well-being. The country's insularity with respect to foreign languages was made painfully clear by this event. Prior to its launch, information about Sputnik I had been published in Russian in a journal to which U.S. scientists had access but did not read. National alarm that the U.S. education system was not competitive with that of the USSR resulted in the passage of the National Defense Education Act of 1958. Foreign language education programs were bolstered considerably, and consistent with the findings of the aforementioned wartime language program, "the army method," now known as the audiolingual method, speaking skills were emphasized instead of reading and writing.

It is worth noting that "Faces of Language" represents the only article Tug ever devoted exclusively to explaining the value of languages. This work appeared in the middle of Tug's publishing career in language education, and seems to reflect only a part of Tug's thinking about the value of languages. He described four aspects or "faces" of language: language as tool, language as communication, language as culture, and language as style (1964a). He described each as both desirable and useful, but it was clear that he envisioned a loose hierarchy in which language as tool offered the narrowest benefit, and language as style the broadest. As an example of language as tool, he described the common graduate school requirement that doctoral students learn to read one or more foreign languages. At best, this purely instrumental use (Gardner & Lambert, 1972) would allow a professional to obtain meaning from a text in his special field so that he was not limited to knowledge printed in English.

The second aspect of language, that of "communication," includes both spoken and written forms and allows "thinking man to transcend the limitations of his own experience and viewpoint by communicating with other thinking men" (307).[4] For example, acquisition of the ability to communicate in another language enables Peace Corps workers to be genuinely helpful in their assignments, Foreign Service offices to handle their work abroad properly, and businessmen to satisfy international customers. He noted, too, that competence in a language may make the difference for students "wishing to see something of the world"; they may indeed elect to travel abroad, and perhaps later also to serve their country overseas (309).

The key to achieving true understanding with speakers of another language is the third aspect, knowledge of their culture. Tug writes that "language is both a vehicle and a mirror of culture," and that mastery of the words of a language is incomplete without an understanding of the behaviors which native speakers typically use to reveal their "feelings, thoughts, attitudes, and values" (313). He approvingly cites the words of Hall (1961): "In addition to what we say with our verbal language we are constantly communicating our real feelings in our silent languages--the language of behavior." The importance of language as culture is illustrated in Wilmarth H. Starr's (1955) anecdote from his period of service as a military strategist in the Pacific during World War II.[5] At a dangerous moment, part of the fleet was immobilized because of lack of information only the Chinese government could provide. Starr, "having learned something of Chinese ways...paid quite an unorthodox call on the distinguished and influential mayor of Shanghai...."

> Not my inadequate Chinese, but about seven cups of tea and the exchange of courtesies in the ancient ritual provided the key. An understanding between men rests upon something more than linguistic exchange; its roots extend into the cultural earth in which the men in question have their origins (1964a:309)

Even in its wartime context, Starr's comment about the creation of "understanding between men" through acquaintance with the other's culture represents the very end which Tug believed language education might achieve. He concluded that, "cultural insight, though dependent on knowledge of language, is even more important than language skills" (319). In the next decades, he would enumerate more and more benefits of linguistically-grounded cultural knowledge.

For the fourth face, language as style, Tug reserved the benefits offered by study of literature in a foreign language.

> And finally, as the last step in this process of breaking out of one's monolingual and monocultural shell, one aspires to an appreciation of the most distinguished expressions of creative thought and imagination in another literature. This requires a sensitiveness to style (319).

Clear in saying that this aspect of language "can contribute most of all to the freeing and to the cultivation--which is to say to the liberal education--of the human spirit" (319), he devotes to it the fewest lines--far fewer than he used to elaborate the notion of language as culture. This certainly reflected no lack of personal sense of the importance of literature. He explained that

> ...the student of style needs to possess a highly developed and refined knowledge of language. Language skill and refinement of mind and sensibility must in fact go hand in hand.

Certainly he did not doubt the importance of literary study for high school language teachers. When asked to write a chapter for Ernest Stabler's (1962) The Education of the Secondary School Teacher, for example, Tug included a detailed observation of a private school French class in which students were reading an extensive list of literary works (1962b). Yet it is worth nothing that his outline of a recommended program in French included not only literary readings, but material on French culture and civilization as well (1962a; 1962b). Indeed, the importance of learning culture which had always been a mainstay in his view of language education seemed to take on new emphasis after he went to Texas. When he called for a realigning of priorities with respect to the preparation of teachers of modern languages the following year, he decried:

> Our traditional misconception of language almost exclusively in terms of grammar, reading, writing, and *belles letters*....Without for a moment underestimating the value of literacy and literature, teachers who understand the nature of language and the process of language learning believe that the learning of speech should precede that of writing, especially for the young learner; that the learning of usage by direct imitation of authentic models should precede the formal study of grammar; and that literature should be studied not less intensively but in relation to other aspects of culture (1965:15.7).

In short, sensing no threat to literature studies, Tug preferred to call greater attention to other languages needs, ones tied to producing teachers with high levels of linguistic and cultural proficiency.

Tug's ideas about the intrinsic value of languages would remain fundamentally the same over the next three decades, but he would emphasize increasingly the need to value and develop the linguistic resources represented by the country's own native speakers of other languages. This held out the best possibility of providing teachers who were "authentic models" of the language they were representing in the classroom.

The Optimum Age and Way to Begin to Learn a Second Language

Tug's belief that early childhood is the best time to acquire a second language has remained unchanged--growing stronger if anything--throughout his career. What he wrote in 1953 differed not at all from what he wrote on the subject in 1969 in Foreign Languages in the Elementary School.

> ...young children many times have been observed to learn several languages simultaneously without the slightest confusion or without the slightest danger to

> their general development. This uncanny ability to absorb languages declines steadily through childhood in direct proportion as children make increased use of their rational and conceptional facilities. Learning the sound patterns of language, which is to say learning to speak a language, is a process therefore which comes most naturally to young children (1953a:).

Focused as he was until the early 1970's on programs for school-aged children, he concluded from his study of young children's language abilities that foreign language education should begin as soon as possible after children begin school.

In the past decade or so, much research and writing has been devoted to the question of whether children or adults were better language learners. Many researchers have been eager to debunk pronouncements like those Tug has often made about the ease with which children acquire languages as compared to adults. One problem for researchers of the question, of course, is that true language knowledge is so difficult to measure. To do so in a way that allows a meaningful comparison between children and adults is even more difficult. Other factors such as motivation are generally not accounted for, though they impinge on the question as well. Since adults' language egos are more fixed than young children's, their motivation for learning the new language may also be different in ways which affect the sort of competence they seek.

Research findings on the age question suggest that adult sophistication in learning and communication strategies and analysis can provide an advantage over young children in initial rate of language learning. To the extent that adults are sophisticated in literacy in their own language, they will also have the advantage in rate of learning to read and write the second language. Although adults *can* acquire native-like pronunciation and intonation, they rarely do, and children seem to have the advantage in these areas. Findings like these provide a fuller answer to the age question; they nevertheless seem not to change the fact that, for whatever reason, a child immersed in a language in its cultural context acquires a sort of seemingly effortless fluency that adults do not.

Tug's conviction about the benefit of an early start was closely tied to what he meant by knowing a language. He was explicit about the connection.

> The understanding that language is talk and that talk is behavior rooted in culture, the realization that young people--the younger the better--are infinitely better equipped to learn languages than are adolescents or adults, the appreciation and utilization of our many speakers of other languages and representatives of other cultures, these basic principles have not been systematically built into our teaching or learning of other languages (1962a:117).

From the beginning of his work in education, he had complained about foreign language teachers who "did not know {the target language} as a living, spoken language, and did not pronounce it accurately" (1953:1).

> To be able to understand and speak another language with a near-native proficiency, a teacher must normally have been exposed to the foreign language before the age of ten. A teacher who has had such an advantage can usually model

> the language adequately for his pupils. We do not mean to imply, of course, that access to our language classrooms should be limited to native speakers of other languages. This *is* an ideal to be strived for, but there are many competent and inspiring teachers..whose teaching is excellent and whose services are needed. But a teacher should be able to recognize when his speech is not authentic and should be ready to supply authentic models of tapes and discs. (1962b:181).

Speaking ability was indispensable, but not sufficient.

> A foreign language teacher should possess native or near-native proficiency in the second language, a sympathetic understanding of the people speaking this language, and a good knowledge of their civilization, especially their literature (1954:66).

Tug often used the example from Francois Gouin (1912) to demonstrate the way that children build proficiency in language as representation and expression of their experiences, in current idiom, their "lived lives." After visiting the flour mill Gouin's three-year old nephew was quiet for an hour before beginning to recount the episode repeatedly. Gouin notes that the child was at this point still absorbing the experience: "he was conceiving it, putting it in order, moulding it into a conception of his own." (1969:37) Indeed, language development at its best seems also to involve building the self. The spoken language of a child, uttered directly from the soul of experience, is precisely what Tug means by the sort of "living language" teachers should be able to model in the classroom. Such language has cultural, but also *personal* authenticity. Tug found McQuown's definition of language a useful restatement of the Gouin example (1955:190).

> Language, most broadly conceived, may be said to include all the ways of behaving which serve to communicate with other persons and to reaffirm an individual's own integrity. Among these ways of behaving are stance, bodily movement, facial expression, oral movement, and speech.

Adults who immerse themselves in a second language by going abroad to live in the country where the language is spoken can also acquire near-native proficiency, but this is relatively rare. When it does occur, the reason would seem to be less that one is "forced to use the language" there than that one is enabled to build a part of self in the new language and culture.

Such authenticity is difficult, nearly impossible for adults to match when exposed only through language classes and study. Krashen's (1981) hypothesis about the constant "monitoring," of language learned from study, the attention to form which usurps attention to self-expression, has given texture to one difference between using a language acquired in childhood and one learned through study in adulthood.

The interruption between self and self-expression is only one of the trials of a language learner; the difficulty of sounding native in pronunciation and intonation is another. Each of these is facilitated by *early* language experience. But Tug's emphasis on an early start was not only a matter of taking advantage of early sensitivity to language, of course; it also had to do with the

extended number of years required to acquire literate sophistication. By the same token, children whose families transmit to them a language other than English should begin to develop literacy in that language in bilingual programs in the elementary grades and continue to do so throughout their schooling.

The Qualities of a Foreign Language Teacher

In spite of the enormous professional attention Tug paid in his career to schools and their programmatic concerns, he was always something of an outsider to "professional educators." On arriving in Austin, in fact, his request for a dual appointment in the College of Education was bluntly rejected by that faculty. Truth be told, although he sincerely wished to work in education, he was probably quite comfortable with a degree of professional distance, a distance which did not evaporate even long after they had officially accepted him in 1965. This is not to say that he did not find colleagues with whom he enjoyed close and respectful relationships. But no product of a College of Education himself, he seems to have felt a closer intellectual home with colleagues grounded in languages and literature.

Throughout his work in education, Tug shied away from detailed talk about "teaching methods." Even during the years when the audiolingual method was coming into vogue, he supported an emphasis on the development of speaking skills while rarely mentioning a particular method. In part, he was very uncomfortable with generic procedures for how teachers whom he had not met should teach students whom he had not met. Instead of a set of prescriptions for what should be done in the classroom, he felt teachers needed as a knowledge base an understanding of the language learning process, of factors which facilitated or inhibited the process, and of possibilities for children's language learning.

The precepts or guidelines he provided from time to time reflected the notions that (1) curricula and methods could not be selected without regard for the personalities of the students and teachers themselves, and (2) the appropriateness of a teaching act could not be viewed in isolation from students' lives outside of school. This was particularly important in the case of younger children.

Envisioning the work of a FLES teacher in 1953, he spoke first of Aage Salling's observations of young children's language development, and then of implications for classroom teachers.

> ....though in the early stages a child's vocabulary may consist of only twenty words, these twenty words are adequate for his needs in the given situation. They constitute a full functional vocabulary permitting him the behavior he craves. When he develops the need for greater behavioral elbow room, he will learn the words and patterns necessary in the new situation. Vocabulary, therefore, grows out of a situation.

This suggests that the language teacher should *start* from a situation and not from language patterns, and most assuredly not from a list of words arbitrarily presented to a student because they happen to occur in a particular text which has been selected by the teacher....

> The good elementary school teacher believes in general that little real teaching is done unless the child is ready and motivated and unless the teaching is given in a way that interests him (1953a:191).

To bilingual teachers in 1974, he spoke of the importance of basing beginning instruction on what children have learned at home.

> This means that you as their kindergarten or first-grade teacher will want to welcome them to school in their own language, guide them in such a way as to minimize the shock of leaving home and going to school, and so teach them that their preschool learning will not be interrupted but rather intensified...The language they bring to school with them is an essential part of them, of their families, and of their community and must be respected without the slightest reservation (1974:931).

Humane, imaginative, and motivated teachers, understanding the importance of these things, would be in a position to make good teaching decisions, adjusting to, and valuing always the uniqueness of the individuals in their charge. This was perhaps the most important message to parents hoping to support their children's early literacy development.

> There is no single method to be prescribed. Since every child is different, and so is every parent, methods too must be infinitely flexible. It is therefore more appropriate to speak not so much of methods as of principles. Right from birth, a child is in some sense an independent human being with an almost infinite potential for growth and development. The successful parent-teacher, therefore, is the one who refrains from imposing his/her will on a child but rather tries to understand the child's efforts to grow, learn, and control the environment. As Trevarthen suggests, it is the child who teaches the parents to teach. The parent who best learns this lesson is likely to be the best teacher (1981:56).

Tug's desire to work directly with educators reflected the depth of his interest in the improvement of language education. While he might well have simply "pushed" for more language requirements, he was convinced that the true possibility for improvement in language *learning* lay with achieving the best possible interaction between student and teacher. As was reflected in so much of Tug's work, success boiled down to the depth of interest on the part of the players, and the degree to which they could communicate successfully. Teaching itself is a matter of using one's language and human resources in such a way as to inspire the development of another's resources. This requires that a teacher be knowledgeable, of course; but what he clearly felt is much more important are the disposition and ability to sense the needs of students--and to meet them. This view of teaching had enormous implications for the sorts of people to be chosen to

teach. Over and over again through the years, when Tug was asked to name ideal qualifications for a language teacher for a particular type of program, he assigned not proficiency, but humanity, the place of first importance. Native-like proficiency in the target language came in second place.

> In the first place, the teacher should be, as often as possible, that magical person who holds before his pupil a lofty vision of life and who is infinitely resourceful in discovering and developing the unlimited possibilities in each one of them (1953a,1).

The emphasis on the interpersonal relationship between teacher and child as the means of discovering the possibilities calls to mind the recent interest in Vygotsky's theory of learning and the extent to which it constitutes "a theory of possibilities" (Moll, 1990). Moll writes,

> The construct of the zone of proximal development reminds us that there is nothing "natural" about educational settings(and about educational practices such as ability groupings, tracking, and other forms of stratification). These settings are social creations: they are socially constituted, and they can be socially changed. It warns us how easy it is to underestimate children's and teacher's abilities when we analyze them in isolation, in highly constrained environments, or in less than favorable circumstances. And it points to the use of social and cultural resources that represent our primary tools, as human beings, for mediating and promoting change (1990:15).

Tug would add that the discovery of possibilities in children, like the achievement of change in social and educational institutions, requires the active use of imagination by individuals in their interpersonal relationships. Even the best intentioned teachers risk limiting children's possibilities if they do not cultivate the use of their own imaginations as a part of the act of teaching.

> It is almost inevitable for a parent or teacher, limited by his own experience, to seek to form a child in his own image instead of rejoicing in his unique differences. We should observe the child closely, be sensitive to hints of interest and curiosity, and learn to respond imaginatively to the child's initiatives.

Tug acknowledged that this charge was a terribly difficult one for teachers responsible for a roomful of students.

By now the reasons for Tug's promotion of the teaching of modern languages in the elementary school are clear. Because of the advantages he saw for an early start in languages, he rarely separated support of language teaching in general from what he had to say in favor of FLES in particular. As he explained once in response to a FLES critic,

> If foreign language learning in high school is justifiable, then it is even more justifiable in the elementary grades, where the psychology of learning favors it (1963:2).

In Tug's view, to support the teaching of languages was to support their introduction in elementary school.

In 1952 when he first began writing to propose this idea, he was quick to point out that FLES was not a new idea, even in this country. Much as he would write later of "the American experience of bilingual education," he sought to show that FLES, too, was part of our history. What he would call "the first stage of FLES" actually followed a period when, beginning as early as 1702, German immigrants had built private schools in order to preserve a German education for their children. By 1840, however, in an effort to lure German American students into public schools, states like Ohio began requiring their city school systems to offer German instruction in the grades. By about 1870, similar programs were in place in New York, St. Louis, Chicago, Indianapolis, and San Francisco. This information comes from the research of Bagster-Collins (1930), who suggests that many other programs may have existed in cities not studied. Tug explains that these programs came to "an undignified halt" as a result of anti-German sentiments surrounding World War I (1955:183). German FLES programs would not reappear significantly until the 1950's (1969). Training for teaching in these programs was almost non-existent.

The end of the war saw the beginning of the second period of FLES when isolated programs sprang up again, this time to teach French or Spanish. The number of such programs was growing by just a few a year, however (1955:183), until the beginning of the third period, which Tug dates on May 3, 1952, when U.S. Commissioner of Education Earl McGrath, returning from a meeting in Beirut full of admiration for the bilingual competence of educators he met there, issued a call for a new national effort to begin teaching languages to elementary school children. The result was that, as Tug explained, "the number of programs begun in 1953 almost equalled the number of durable programs begun since 1921" (1955:183).

By the time Commissioner McGrath made his momentous speech, Tug had completed a second year as Director of the Yale Master of Arts in Teaching program, and, as mentioned, had already initiated as a part of it a FLES teacher preparation program. Under his direction, the April 1952 Yale-Barnard Conference had also included presentations and discussions about FLES. With these initiatives Tug had begun to lay down the intellectual foundation for FLES while also taking on the challenge of its practical necessities. It will not surprise us that, in so doing, he was breaking new ground in this country. We may be less aware that, although there were a few FLES programs abroad, he had this same effect internationally at the August, 1953, UNESCO Conference. There the presentation of his most thorough rationale for FLES to date stirred great controversy. He summarized the reaction later.

> With respect to the best age to begin a foreign language, there was considerable hesitation. It has been traditional in all parts of the world to start a second language at the beginning of secondary school, at the age of approximately eleven. So deeply rooted is this tradition that there were many delegates who seemed reluctant to examine the arguments in favor of any earlier start. Others, however,...readily admitted the persuasiveness of these arguments and insisted that they should be tested by experience. On the whole, the experiments in our country will be watched with greater and greater interest (1954a:63).

Besides presenting a broad and interdisciplinary theoretical base, the UNESCO paper reflected a conception of FLES as part of a continuous language program involving all levels of schooling. If FLES succeeded, he theorized, then what took place in the elementary schools could "in time renew completely the methods used in high school and even on the college level" (1955:195).

> If full advantage is taken of the powers of very young children to learn the basic linguistic skills, and if teachers of sufficiently high calibre can be prepared quickly enough, it should soon be possible, at least in the more favoured communities, to teach children to understand and to speak a foreign language within reasonable limits in the primary grades. It should be possible to teach the elements of reading and writing, starting with the notion of eye support for ear learning, in the middle grades. By the time the student reaches the junior high school, his analytical sense should permit the study of the more formal aspects of the language, or grammar, as well as progress in understanding, speaking, reading and writing. This in turn, would allow greater concentration at the senior high school level on systematic consideration of the civilization of the country whose language is being learned. Literary and civilizational elements should of course be introduced from the very beginning but can be systematized at this point. Such a program in the schools would permit in the college and universities teaching of a really advanced nature, appropriate to the university (195).

The key, of course, was the preparation of teachers, and from his first presentation in support of FLES, he had spoken of the necessity to proceed at a modest rate so that teachers might be properly prepared: *"It is far better that this movement develop slowly than that it develop badly"* [italics his] (1952:124).

Back in this country, support from the Office of Education sputtered when McGrath resigned in 1953. By that time, however, programs were continuing to multiply, and the Modern Language Association had begun several initiatives which related to FLES. Having only recently founded a Foreign Language Program with the assistance of three-year grant from the Rockefeller Foundation, the association leadership frankly hesitated to take up the uncharted waters of FLES along with its other new charges. Nevertheless, it felt that it must assume responsibility for trying to thoughtfully guide the movement so as to ensure quality--in the words of Program Director William Riley Parker, to try "to put some bones into FLES" (1954:148).[6] Gradually the

remarkable growth in FLES usurped MLA attention from secondary and university programs issues. Parker wrote in 1955,

> From my travels and talk with many persons I learned that there is some criticism in the profession of the extent to which the FL Program has thus far seemed to emphasize FLES, the teaching of languages in the grades; but I say to you...we talk so much about the elementary school movement because there is comparatively little *movement* at the other levels to discuss. Moreover, we have a bear by the tail and we dare not let it go.(148).

Like Tug, Parker worried that programs were springing up without the proper planning, and particularly, without properly prepared teachers. Parker was determined that the association would provide leadership on the latter score (1955:148). Unfortunately, one has the impression that the efforts amounted to struggling to provide training for horses that were already out of the barn.

Tug provided assistance to the MLA even before leaving Yale in 1955 to become Associate Director, then Director of the Modern Language Association Foreign Language Program. In June 1954 he participated on a select committee meeting at the MLA headquarters in New York City to draft a list of "Considerations for Initiating a Program of Modern Foreign Languages in an Elementary School" (Modern Language Association, 1955a:99). Later that year Tug co-directed (with Wilmarth Starr) the MLA-sponsored Conference on the Teaching of Modern Languages and Intercultural Understanding. When, in April 1956, the Association Foreign Language Steering Committee revised its policy statements, Tug's influence was clear. The sections on intercultural understanding and on foreign languages in the elementary school constituted major additions. In the latter case, the new policies for the first time reflected the MLA's "approval of this popular movement in American education"(1956:410); the document included a brief but thoughtful rationale for FLES, and cautionary statements about the prerequisites for proper program initiation.

After leaving the MLA, Tug continued to be a major player in FLES. He continued serving on the MLA Advisory and Liaison Committees, which in 1961 developed a "Second Statement of Policy" regarding FLES. The effort was aimed at clarifying the definition and purpose of FLES, and at establishing priorities. One problem was that some programs had opted simply to focus on "intercultural understanding," minimizing the language instruction, and simply teaching children *about* the target culture (1969a:185). Another was articulation with other parts of the foreign language programs (1969a:194). In December of 1963, Tug worked with other members of an MLA committee to draft standards for teacher education programs "for specialists in foreign languages at all levels" (1969a:198). At the same time the committee issued a "Call to Action to Overcome the Critical Shortage of Teachers of Modern Foreign Languages." Here the committee seamed to deal directly with Tug's concern that native speakers of the target languages were being passed over in the narrow focus on coursework. The call was made to state education departments and to foreign language university faculty to seek to "certify any teacher candidate who demonstrates that he possesses the requisite personal qualities, knowledge, and skills, *no matter how they have been acquired*" (200).

Throughout the decade, Tug offered hope for FLES, noting that bilingual education offered new insights, new opportunities for the learning of foreign languages in the elementary

schools. Yet, in the closing chapter of his FLES book in 1969, Tug notes that "FLES hangs precariously in the balance" (187). The rush of many schools to implement programs without proper resources, and particularly, of course, without proper teachers, had led to a tide of mediocre programs, and to a certain disillusionment. A lack of adequate funding, springing from "the widespread and unrealistic tendency to want quality in education but to vote against the tax increases to support it"(184) had plagued the movement since the very beginning. Although many successful programs had demonstrated the potential of FLES, he felt that these successes might be multiplied only through the "mobilization of the whole language-teaching profession for a no-nonsense kind of teaching and vigorous support of FLES by the educational establishment and by fellow citizens (188).

University Language Department Leadership

In the early years as Chairman of Romance languages at Texas, Tug seems to have focused his efforts on four issues. First was development of the graduate faculty. Harry Ransom had selected Tug as a person who could build a department of the highest quality. With support from Ransom, Tug and the department successfully recruited a number of top literary scholars, including several from abroad. By 1964 the Department of Romance Languages would be rated 15th in the country in quality of graduate faculty; the faculty in Spanish would be ranked 9th (Cartter, 1966:30).

Second, given the joint responsibility of universities and state education agencies for the certification of language teachers, it was imperative that the university work with representatives of state education agencies to develop ways of identifying satisfactory candidates. As Director of the Foggy Bottom Research Study Conference on Problems of State-Level Supervision of Instruction in Modern Foreign Languages at George Washington University in 1960, he arranged for university professors, language teachers, and 32 state supervisors of foreign languages[7] to spend two weeks developing strategies for improving the process and requirements for certifying teachers of modern languages. In "Do We Want Certified Teachers or Qualified Ones?"--an article whose title continues to haunt us today--he cited a severe shortage of qualified teachers and called for a complete overhaul (1963a). This would require initiative on the part of university language departments to assure that the best possible candidates were certified. Specifically, he worried that the inflexible course requirements discouraged the most fluent, best enculturated speakers of the target language while less proficient teachers were certified without regard for functional competence.

> If the system of basing a teaching license primarily on hour credits was ever justifiable--as I believe it was not--it seems more than ever indefensible in our present critical situation. Instead, I believe that teacher-preparing institutions and state departments of education should in cooperation completely revise procedures for the preparation of teachers by basing a teaching license on demonstrated proficiency, however this proficiency may have been acquired.

A third group of his efforts concerned the development of public school-university language sequences which would enable serious students to achieve the desired proficiency by the end of the university teacher preparation program. In "An FL Blueprint in Focus," he sketched such a plan calling for the beginning of foreign language teaching "ideally in kindergarten or *in the first grade at the latest"*(1962a:116). University departments in the meantime, however, must develop an understanding and appreciation of the work of high school language teachers. For this reason, within a year after becoming Chairman of the University of Texas Department of Romance Languages in 1959, Tug created a position in the department to be filled each year by one highly qualified high school language teacher who would teach language courses and serve as consultant for the faculty. This modest but innovative step deserves elaboration.

Tug selected a Spanish teacher in each case, and this choice seems to have been related to his fourth major effort in his new position. He was troubled by the absence among the faculty of his new department of Mexican Americans. Specifically, he sought Mexican Americans who, besides mastering the standard Spanish of the Americas, could also offer authentic linguistic and cultural knowledge about the native Spanish of Texas. Whether Tug's plan for bringing high school teachers into the department had an impact on language teaching there is difficult to say. What is clear is that the people he discovered would prove remarkable human and linguistic resources in a much broader arena.

George Blanco tells in this volume of how in 1961 Tug recruited him from an El Paso, Texas high school to teach in the department and to serve as consultant on the teaching of Spanish. Marie Esman Barker, also from El Paso, had preceded George and began working toward her doctorate. When George moved on to a consultant position at the Texas Education Agency the following year, Albar Peña was lured from Falfurrias High School in South Texas. George, of course, would earn his doctorate and pioneer the bilingual education teacher training program at the University of Texas. Albar Peña would complete his doctorate and immediately go to Washington, D.C. to become the first Title VII Director, overseeing the awarding of the first program grants funded under the 1968 Bilingual Education Act. Marie Esman Barker would author Spanish language textbooks. To say that Tug could identify quality people to push the teaching of Spanish is an understatement. To say that his plan ultimately affected language teaching is, too.

Tug's concern that Mexican Americans be represented in the Department of Romance Languages was one of several concerns about the status of Spanish speakers in Texas. He was clearly upset by the lack of respect in Texas for the Spanish of its own Spanish-speaking population, and wrote about it in 1958 in markedly testy fashion:

> The false belief that there exists one standard form of "good" or correct Spanish is widespread. I have heard it many times since coming to Texas. For example, I have heard a school principal say about his so-called Latin children, "They don't speak either English or Spanish." And yet when they return to their families or play with other Spanish-speaking children, they leave no doubt as to their ability to speak Spanish (1959:348).

It is significant that he wrote this in a presentation at the Pan American Round Table meeting which took place in Austin, Texas, in November, 1958, then sent it to the "Shop-Talk" section

of Hispania, the journal published by the American Association of Teachers of Spanish and Portuguese. The message was not only for Texans, but for his Spanish-teaching colleagues at home and around the country as well.

Immediately upon arriving in Texas in 1957, Tug had begun visiting schools in East Austin where the proportion of Spanish-speaking children was large. He was particularly distressed by the prejudice he found toward Spanish-speaking families, and by the fact that many Mexican American parents and children had internalized a low opinion of their language:

> Even Spanish speakers themselves are infected with this idea and often apologize for speaking a local dialect. We all start by speaking our local dialect, nor would our speech ever change if we did not move out of our own cultural group (1959:348).

Bilingual Education

In 1958, Tug was invited to a meeting at the Texas Education Agency at which school superintendents from around the state were discussing a plan for children of migrant farmworkers. Because the growing season called for parents to be working in the northern and western part of the country in the fall and late spring, these children, mostly of Mexican American Spanish-speaking families, missed large amounts of school and fell far behind their peers. The proposed plan was to lengthen the schoolday, increasing the amount of school contact hours during the months when the children were available. When his moment to comment came, Tug remarked that the plan seemed to him a fine one--except for one thing. It contained nothing about teaching the children in Spanish. "These children *do* speak Spanish, don't they?" Al Ramírez recounts what happened next: "Icicles began forming on the walls." The hostile reception was predictable. Throughout the Southwest, schools had undertaken as their responsibility to forbid the use of Spanish by Mexican-American children, thereby in theory forcing them to use English. It was commonly accepted in school districts, no doubt many whose administrators were sitting in the room that day, that the way to "handle" Spanish was to punish children, often physically, for using it on school premises. Various superintendents rose in turn now to castigate Tug, ridiculing the idea that the children should be taught anything but English. Al, Assistant Superintendent of the Edinburg schools at the time, and delighted by Tug's question, was precluded from saying so outright by the fact that his boss was present and had immediately stated his objection. Al rose and simply began to talk, walking a tightrope--neither criticizing Tug's comment nor supporting it--and thereby letting Tug know he had one vote of confidence. The plan was not changed, but a ripple had been made, and Tug and Al Ramírez began a long and close friendship.

The early Texas experiences seem to have touched Tug personally, for his writings of the next few years reveals an emotional edge not perceptible before. He knew firsthand about being a child who spoke a language that was different. From the age of four he had experienced some of the benefits of learning the language of others; on arriving in Sweden, his rapid acquisition of Swedish brought new playmates, new ways of playing, and opened up a fresh new world full of wonder and intimacy around his mother's family home. Through maintenance and study of Swedish in the United States, he expanded his "five-year-old's language" into one which would

serve him for communication purposes and allow him to read literature and the considerable language research printed in Swedish. Although he has felt frustrated that his Swedish was not developed more thoroughly (1981a), it has served him for maintaining important family and professional relationships in Sweden; he has returned there often to renew his Swedish self.

Not surprisingly, Tug bristled when principals and teachers showed such disregard for the usefulness of Spanish as to describe Mexican American children as "ignorant in two languages."

> This is all the more absurd when one considers that our "ignorant bilingual" can communicate with the other hundred and thirty million or so Spanish speakers who populate the Hispanic world from Spain to Tierra del Fuego (1967:2).

It was clear to him that their Spanish could be used to communicate with many, many international neighbors. This capacity could be strengthened with attention from the schools.

> While most Spanish speakers in Texas feel at ease in their own group or community, they may feel ill equipped in Mexico City, Buenos Aires, or Madrid. It is precisely the function of the school to broaden their experiences through formal education to the point where they will feel comfortable away from home as well as at home, and in English as well as Spanish (1969a:73).

Even the unmatched clarity with which he spoke of the appropriateness of the Texas dialect of Spanish may have had roots in his childhood experience. The Swedish that Tug acquired at age four was a rural, regional variety, clearly marked among other things by the systematic and pervasive omission of certain consonants. Like many dialects of the so-called backwoods variety, it was the subject of imitation and jokes among Swedes. Tug tells a wonderful story about his father's coming to spend Christmas the first year that he and his mother were in Sweden. His father had grown up in the university city of Uppsala, and his Swedish reflected this. He must have found it jarring to discover that the English-speaking little boy who had bid him farewell months earlier was not only a Swedish-speaker, but a thorough Dalecarlian, a "dalkarl," a perfect representative of the local dialect and culture. Fortunately he was pleased and expressed no reservation whatsoever, recognizing his son's Swedish as perfectly appropriate for where he was.

His reacquisition of English on returning to New Haven at age six gave him access to books and school. This return also gave him a brush with outsider status and the sense of personal and social vulnerability which can render knowing a "foreign" language a liability. Recognizing an old and familiar fear among Spanish-speaking children in the United States, he wrote about his own childhood bilingual experience for the first time in 1959.

> One day in a supermarket I heard an American mother call out to her daughter, saying that they were ready to go. The little girl looked frightened, peered around to see if anyone had overheard, and then in a hushed but intense whisper remonstrated with her mother. Why this strange reaction? Simply this, that the mother, a native American citizen of Puerto Rican birth used her mother tongue:

> "Ven acá, nos vamos." The little girl, afraid of being conspicuous, resented being spoken to in a "foreign" language.
>
> I still remember my fear of being discovered by other children to be the kind of curiosity--even monstrosity--that spoke an outlandish tongue called Swedish. Fortunately, my mother and my first school teacher put their heads together and I was not called on in the classroom for the three or four weeks I needed to regain the use of English (349).

By good fortune, he had been protected from the sort of negative and prejudiced social climate victimizing Mexican American children at a tender age.

This may explain the fact that from the very beginning effort at promoting bilingual education in the schools, he sought to rectify the school social climate by including Anglo children who would learn Spanish as a second language. In September of 1959, he reported the beginning of a project in four schools entitled "An Elementary School Language Experiment: Literacy in Two Languages." Spanish would be taught to all first-grade children.

> Our objectives are to learn as much as we can about the best ways of teaching the elements of Spanish speech to English-speakers and the best ways of helping Spanish-speaking children to learn English and to improve their command of Spanish (350).

Although I find no report of the project results, and one imagines that this beginning must have been extremely difficult, the project design reflected his sense that Mexican American children's knowledge of Spanish was of value not only to themselves, but also to Anglo children. In learning Spanish directly from their schoolmates, they might profit not only by the exposure to authentic Spanish, but also by inoculation against some prejudices common in the society in which they lived. In turn, the Anglo children might be of help to the Mexican American Spanish speakers, not by teaching them English, which is the common assumption upon which many bilingual programs operate today, but by reinforcing the desirability for everyone to learn Spanish. Both groups of children might thereby grow up to more nearly approximate the citizens of "interpersonal, intercultural, and international" understanding which Tug had been speaking about for a decade.

> ...we want to encourage in the Spanish-speaking children a confidence and sense of pride in their language and cultural heritage. We believe that this can be achieved if they see that the English-speaking children really want to learn Spanish. And in the English speaking children we hope to encourage a warm and sympathetic interest in Spanish and particularly in speakers of Spanish (350).

Tug's understanding of the prime importance of the social and cultural processes surrounding bilingual education would be demonstrated in the well-known St. Lambert Experiment in the research of Wallace Lambert and Richard Tucker (1972). His hunches about the relative value of what we have come to call "two-way" programs have been supported recently by Collier and

Thomas (1989). In comparing several program types, the latter found that neither students from English-only programs or from early exit bilingual programs, on the average,ever reach the national norm set for English-only children. Still examining student performance from grades K-12, the researchers found that students from late-exit bilingual programs achieve, on the average, above those norms. Students in two-way programs however, achieve higher than late-exit students.

In 1962, Tug's plan for bilingual education, and its relation to his previous work, was becoming very clear. Beginning with the fact that the Spanish-speaking children themselves "are precisely the kind of people whose need was so sorely felt during and after World War II," he added

> By the simple expedient of teaching them first the elements of reading and writing in Spanish while they are learning to understand and speak English and while their English-speaking classmates are learning reading and writing in English and the elements of spoke Spanish, most of these young Americans *could* become literate bilinguals....In this way we can, if we wish, produce generations of bilinguals, the kind of people who can provide the key to communication with peoples in other parts of the world. (1962a:116)

Increasingly through the decade, Tug talked about the value of learning through the mother tongue, "the language through which one develops a self image and a view of the world"(1967:2).

> For children who have been born into a Spanish-speaking family, who have played in Spanish with children of the neighborhood, who have in short opened their eyes on a corner of the Hispanic world, Spanish is the normal medium for assimilating experience, for learning, and for expressing one's personality,(1969a:69-70.)

> The child's mother tongue is not only an essential part of his sense of identity; it is also his best instrument for learning, especially in the early stages (Andersson & Boyer, 1970:49)

It was this very "enculturation," this "learning of a language in the context of its culture," which made Mexican American Spanish-speaking children who became literate in their language invaluable resources as future teachers of Spanish (1962b:164). Having worked for a decade with the difficult problem of preparing foreign language teachers who would have the near-native language proficiency needed to be good language models of school children, Tug recognized that, even before coming to school, Mexican American Spanish-speaking children possessed a fluency, pronunciation, and cultural authenticity in Spanish that most foreign language students would not manage after years of study (1969a:70). In various (very unsubtle) ways, he redoubled his insistence that this resource be developed and that only authentic models of Spanish should become teachers of the language.

In "A New Focus on the Bilingual Child," he emphasized the potential benefit of Mexican American cultural knowledge for classroom teaching:

> Just as a student needs an authentic speaker as a model, so he needs as a teacher an authentic, well educated representative of another culture if he is to be imbued by direct experience with some intimate understanding of this culture....In Texas,...where at least one Texan out of seven speaks Spanish natively, only about one out of four teachers of Spanish is a native speaker of Spanish. One out of two would be a better ratio to aim at immediately.(1965:158)

That this had repercussions for university language departments preparing foreign language teachers, he had been pointing out for some time:

> If we agree that the hard core of a language teacher's qualifications is mastery of language and cultural awareness, we are bound to accept certain implications. For one thing, we should recruit far more of our teacher candidates from among those of our citizens who have learned a second language in it cultural context (1962b:186).

The language preparation of teachers for bilingual programs would also require special attention from universities. Teacher preparation programs would have to be designed in cooperation with modern language teachers.

> The insufficient education in Spanish of many southwestern Spanish-surnamed teachers leaves them with deficiencies of which they are well aware...Many a Spanish speaker, conscious of his lack of formal study of the language, underestimates the great advantage he has over those who have academic knowledge alone. For example, the native speaker of Spanish, though he may never have had any schooling in the language, has complete control of its sound system and structure as used in his locale; he can communicate with ease and fluency with other Spanish speakers in his community. In fact, he can understand and be understood by Spanish speakers from any part of the Hispanic world. Dialectal differences in lexicon, in structure, and in pronunciation very rarely constitute a serious obstacle to communication.
>
> At the same time many Spanish speakers *do* have some shortcomings. The most common are lack of skill in reading and writing, lack of vocabulary beyond immediate needs, lack of control of some levels of expression, lack of formal knowledge of grammar, and inexperience with dialects of other regions (Andersson & Boyer,1970:118).

At this early stage, when teacher preparation programs were only beginning to be a reality, language institutes were begun around the country for native Spanish-speaking elementary school teachers planning to teach in bilingual education. Tug himself conducted one in Austin in 1968.

As important as the linguistic and cultural authenticity of such teachers could be in FLES programs, it would play an even more important role in bilingual programs. In two-way programs for both Anglo and Mexican American children, bilingual teachers would be using both their

Spanish and their cultural knowledge for creating an atmosphere of intercultural learning (1969a:71). It would be of possibly even greater use for working in the Mexican American community itself, where the teacher could,

> ...depending on his or her personality, experience, and perceptiveness, play a decisive role in the classroom, in the homes of children, and in the community at large. In the classroom the teacher or teaching team is forging a new role in American education, built on a new understanding of what has gone into the child's preschool learning, and above all an understanding of the value of the home culture. The teacher can greatly increase his effectiveness by directly or indirectly extending his efforts into the home and tapping the enormous educational resources represented by the various members of the extended family and especially capitalizing on the great learning potential of the young preschool children. (1974:931)

The notion that teachers should seek to tap resources in the home is one only now becoming generally accepted through such work as that of Moll & Greenberg (1990) and Delgado-Gaitán (1992). From the beginning Tug saw this interactive connection as vitally important for bilingual teachers, who had the special responsibility of creating a sense of cultural continuity and culturally based confidence between home and school. Specifically, parents must know they are valued by the school as language and culture teachers. Parents and communities, of course, are the primary sources of children's opportunities for bilingualism and biculturalism. As Tug had indicated before, language and culture are not usefully separable; bilingual programs should be planned to preserve the home culture as well as the home language.

> ...for it is culture, including language, which gives the individuals of a community a fellow feeling and it is a community's cultural heritage which constitutes its collective memory, linking the past to the present. The preservation of this cultural heritage and of this fellow feeling is as important as are the maintenance and cultivation of the home language. Indeed it is vastly more important, for a whole traditional sense of values and a whole life style are involved, which are all reflected in language but which also transcend language (1973a:5).

In the case of preservation of language and culture, he and Mildred Boyer had unequivocally rejected programs which made only temporary use of the home language before shifting to all-English instruction: "Transitional bilingual education is no bilingual education at all." There were at least two reasons for this. The first had to do with the reduction of the child's capacity for full bilingualism which would result from the abandonment of the mother tongue:

> In the case of American children who are born into a non-English language, not to give them the education needed to perfect their first language to the point of usefulness amounts to a virtual betrayal of the children's potential (1973a:11).

Transitional programs risked turning a potential double advantage to a "double failure." In failing to emphasize bilingual children's "right to read their mother tongue," schools ultimately were also less successful in helping them read English (1976). Tug often referred to Chester Christian's (1976:172) observation about the importance of biliteracy:

> In an important sense the education of those who speak two or more languages can never be "equal" to the education of monolinguals: it must be inferior or superior. Whether it will be the one or the other depends heavily on whether literacy is provided in only one or in both languages.

The second deficiency of transitional bilingual education is related to the loss of linguistic resources. In a 1976 Hispania article, for example, Tug explained by calling for the "reconciliation" of popular and elite bilingualism (1976a). Popular bilingualism was the sort Mexican Americans generally possessed; fluent speakers of Spanish and English, they had not had the opportunity to formalize their knowledge of Spanish through schooling. For this reason, and because of the common disparagement of their dialect, their bilingualism tends not to be highly valued by either Anglos or Mexican Americans themselves. Maintenance programs, unfortunately rare, held out the possibility of cultivating Spanish as a fully developed spoken and written language. Tug concluded that "only if popular
bilingualism leads to elite bilingualism is there any prospect of maintaining Spanish as a precious national resource" (1976a:498).

Interestingly, it was only at this point in his career that he began to incorporate into his writing fuller accounts of his own experience of childhood bilingualism. When he first did so, he was considering together the resource that was popular bilingualism, and the common deficiencies in the training of language teachers. In "What Lessons Does Bilingual Education Hold for Foreign Language Teacher Trainers," a 1977 article in The Modern Language Journal, he described in some detail his memories of his two years in Sweden, and spoke of how these experiences fostered his interest in other languages and cultures:

> As I look back on my career as teacher of French and Spanish--not Swedish--I realize that these first two years were by far the most important of my preparation. Clearly teacher training institutions cannot include such an experience as a required part of their programs nor even as a prerequisite for admission to teacher education. But I would see nothing but advantage in taking such preparation into account or even recruiting teacher candidates partly on the basis of such experience.
>
> In my case, this experience helped me to understand the process of absorbing a second culture and to realize how all-embracing and permanent a culture is when acquired in a natural setting. It enabled me to understand what it means to acquire an authentic native control of a second language as an integral part of a second culture (1977:1).

Another lesson from his own experience was, as he put it, "the superiority of out-of-school learning in a natural cultural setting to artificial in-school learning." His observation of most bilingual teachers who were native speakers of the target language confirmed for him that it was precisely their out-of-school learning of home language and culture which generally made them better qualified than other language teachers. His interest in the potential of home learning had been stirred eight years before, but from this point on, it would become his primary focus.

Preschool Biliteracy

In 1969 Tug came across an advertisement for Glenn Doman's How to Teach Your Baby to Read, bought the book, and "devoured it." By coincidence, within a month he received a letter from a Swedish professor, Ragnhild Söderbergh, telling how she had adapted Doman's method and taught her child to read between the ages of 2 years, 4 months and 3 years, 6 months. She later sent him the book in which she documented the process, Reading in Early Childhood (1971). He was captivated by the scientific Söderbergh work as well as the more popularly conceived Doman book.

Three of Doman's points were striking. First, very young children not only can but *want* to and *should* learn to read, taking advantage of their special learning powers in the first few years of life; adult assumptions that learning to read was an arduous task for which children would need five or six years of life preparation were thoroughly mistaken. Second, in explaining children's capacity to learn to read, Doman wrote,

> It makes no difference to the brain whether it "sees" a sight or "hears" a sound. It can understand both equally well. All that is required is that the sounds be loud enough for the ear to hear and the words big and clear enough for the eye to see so that the brain can interpret them--the former we have done but the latter we have failed to do" (Doman;1981:6).

The third point was that mothers, or sometimes fathers, were the best teachers. Knowing the child's personality, they are in the best position to choose words and books of interest to the child, and in general to tailor the reading acquisition assistance to the child's own desires. Söderbergh's meticulous account showed how a mother and daughter's bedtime reading, conversations, and word-sharing, lasting between five and twenty minutes, enabled the child gradually to "break the code"(6). Their reading routine did not end when her daughter had become an independent reader; their conversations "about books and life" remained a cherished time of togetherness, a joyful expression of the parent-child relationship.

Tug, of course, had been champion of progressively younger children's language abilities since the early 50's when he had insisted that foreign languages should be taught during the elementary years. He had often pointed out that one advantage of bilingual education over FLES programs was that the former began in kindergarten at age 5 whereas the latter generally delayed language instruction until the third grade. But the idea that much younger children would learn to read at about the same time they learned to talk seemed to have confirmed some "vague preconceptions" he had had as well (1981). He was also intrigued by the notion that "so long as

it is done on a one-to-one basis, there is at least a chance that the uniqueness of the individual child may be recognized" (1975:21).

He began reading everything he could find about early reading--"how to" books as well as research by psychologists on the remarkable ability of babies to learn and to communicate in the first years of life. Particularly useful to him were Bloom's (1964) work on the rapid growth in intelligence between the ages of birth and four, Condon and Sanders'(1974) findings that newborns responded rhythmically to human voices but not to tapping noises, Trevarthen's (1977) studies on the abilities of babies to communicate from birth, and of course, Montessori's well-known conclusions on the ability of children before the age of three to acquire as many languages as are found useful in the child's immediate environment (1973a). These convinced him further "that sensitive parents can supply external stimulation to match the inner development of very young children and that, if this moment of match is missed, it may never recur with the same excitement" (1979:12).

He wrote in the Foreword to a reprinting of Söderbergh's book,

> ....when I sought to share my enthusiasm with my colleagues specializing in reading, I met with politeness (for we were in Texas), but also with glassy eyes. When later I asked Glenn Doman why he was not better known among academics, he replied that he was addressing his message not to academics, who are more given to talk than to action, but rather to mothers, who are highly motivated to raise their children in the best way they can (Söderbergh, 1977:IX).

As before, he would not be discouraged by a bit of colleaguial skepticism. He was becoming aware of more and more cases of preschool literacy and biliteracy. Examples of the latter he found particularly intriguing. Ok Ro Lee, a doctoral student of Robert Lado's at Georgetown University, helped his daughter Yuha to learn to read English before school, and her native Korean shortly thereafter. The biliteracy development of Mariana and Elena Past is recounted in Al Past's (1976) dissertation and Kay's (1975) Master's thesis, both directed by Tug. Chester Christian, whose friendship dates from the early sixties, corresponded with Tug during the biliteracy development of two his youngest children (1976). His contribution to the 1971 Conference on Child Language appeared in Bilingualism in Early Childhood; his paper (1977) joins Söderbergh's (1977) in dealing with preschool literacy at this early date.

What Tug read suggested that it was relatively easy for parents to help their children learn to read:

> Parents are in the best position to supervise and stimulate the development of children during their most favorable learning period, between birth and five. The point is that in the child's eyes parents are--or can be--the most important, the most prestigious persons around. Everything they do serves as a model for children's learning (1981:53).

> The parent is the best "teacher", especially in the early months and years, but the word in this context has a special sense. The teacher is a model for reading as for

> speaking but senses the child's interests and provides the material and activities for satisfying these interests (1980:392).

Tug pointed out that talking to the children, constantly including them in family life, was most important of all. Various members of the family should read and tell stories to the child. Singing and finger play games at baby's bedtime could be joined by word and letter games later on. As the example of Ragnhild Söderbergh suggested, the key lay in proposing reading activities that both parent and child might enjoy, and then following the child's lead. In this way, children first experience literacy and interpersonal learning in the joyful context of a loving relationship. They have their natural curiosity about their world encouraged by being talked to and read to by the most important persons in their lives; gradually they become able to feed their own curiosity by choosing their own books and perhaps rereading favorites dozens of times:

> When this initiation into reading occurs without pressure of strain but with love and enthusiasm and with free play of imagination, the child can acquire early not only the skill of getting meaning out of print but also a lively sense of curiosity and a taste for words and languages--which is to say, literature (1975:26)

In this area of literacy as in those of language and culture, "bilingual families have an enormous advantage over monolingual families so long as they realize it and continue to improve their knowledge of both languages" (1973:12). Recalling the faces of language, Spanish-speaking Mexican American children, for instance, begin with such a tremendous headstart in commanding Spanish as a tool, as communication, and as culture that very few

English-speaking peers will ever catch up. By ensuring literacy in Spanish, literacy naturally grounded in fully enculturated Spanish proficiency, children begin, even before school, to develop command of their native language as style.

Children who become literate in their heritage language may experience initial literacy as a natural reaffirmation of their family experiences and identities; this sort of literacy encourages the maintenance of the mother tongue. As in the cases of Yuha Lee and Raquel and Aurelio Christian, the grounding of linguistic identity in literary connection with their forbearers might better steel them to the negative social environment surrounding American speakers of non-English languages.

In 1976, looking to early reading as an opportunity "to fortify the bilingual education of the preschool child," Tug began the Preschool Literacy Project, to test the hypothesis that Spanish-speaking Mexican American children between the ages of one and a half and three and a half or four can learn to read Spanish and that between the ages of four and six, having been exposed to spoken English, they can learn to read English (1976b:5).

Tug's convictions about the possibilities of preschool reading for language minority children became a completely new chapter entitled "Preschool Bilingual Education" in the second edition of Bilingual Schooling. He began by pointing out that although both the 1968 and 1974 Bilingual Education Acts contained provisions for preschool education, little use had been made of them.

He proposed that schools, parents, and libraries create programs to encourage the development of home language literacy in preschool children, concluding the chapter with a statement of the importance of cooperative efforts to support home languages and home cultures.

> The grim alternative for the minority individual is the risk of losing his soul, for the minority group the risk of losing its culture. The loss of either is as much a loss to the majority group as to the minority, for both are bound together in a common fate (1978:166-167).

By 1981, in his Guide to Family Reading in Two Languages, he thoroughly wove together the messages he had learned from his own childhood experiences and his concerns for the language development of other children "lucky enough to come from bilingual families." Seeing that schools did not often strive to develop children's Spanish, he had gradually been addressing parents more and more directly with this message. After briefly recounting the way in which he learned Swedish, he wrote of the fact that even his idyllic family soaking in Swedish as a preschooler had not enabled him to become fully bilingual, had not prevented his losing command of Swedish over time. The rich linguistic advantage he enjoyed as a preschooler was gradually diminished because his family, focused on English, did not help to cultivate his Swedish; they did not think to read him stories in Swedish, or to help him learn to read and write it.

> For me, as for millions of immigrants to this country, the critical moment was lost and my home language succumbed to English. Instead of becoming easily and proudly bilingual, biliterate, and bicultural--like Yuha Lee--I became essentially monolingual, monoliterate, and monocultural and thus less well equipped to serve my country than I might have been (1981:53).

The result was a loss of potential to society, and a loss of capacity for himself. The parallel to Mexican American families was clear; he laid it out straight-forwardly, taking into account the oft-heard reasoning that Mexican American children could concentrate on English first, waiting to learn Spanish in high school:

> Many minority families think that speaking their language at home is enough to assure its maintenance, but the history of Spanish in the Southwest proves the fallacy of this view. The experience of whole generations of Spanish speakers, for example, on entering school has been to be taught reading and writing in *English*. On reaching high school they are offered an opportunity to "study Spanish," that is, to learn its grammar and read and write it as though it were a foreign language. Unfortunately the desire has long since evaporated in the individual, and the opportunity for society to preserve Spanish as a valuable resource is squandered. And the same phenomenon is to be observed in dozens of other languages (1981:53).

Instead, by cultivating the home language from the early years, families had the opportunity to foster their children's thorough and confident bilingualism and biculturalism. Their children would begin school with a distinct educational and psychological advantage. It was his hope that these children and their families would gradually inspire a greater number of bold and innovative programs like a very few he had seen.

> When they enter school, I should like to see them go to such a school as the Humphreys Avenue School in East Los Angeles, where the Bilingual Bicultural Language Arts Program, sponsored by E.S.E.A. Title III, encourages the children to broaden their experiences, acquire a positive self identity, read in Spanish and English, write and illustrate their own books, expand their learning individually and in groups, and in general, help mold the kind of community in which it is fun to live (1977a:529).

Conclusion

In 1905, the 91-year forced union of Norway with Sweden had become intolerable for the Norwegians, who were insisting on more control of their own foreign affairs (Scott, 1977). After conducting a series of political maneuvers, the Norwegian parliament,the storting, declared unilaterally that the union with Sweden was dissolved, and the Swedish king deposed. War was threatened by both sides. At that point, four Norwegian leaders went to Stockholm and began to explain the Norwegian position to the various contacts they had there. By the time the Swedish parliament met to decide what should be done, the calls for an invasion of Norway were balanced by other voices now convinced that "the divorce" from Norway should simply be accepted. Following a month of angry debate, the parliament voted to accept the disunion. Delegations from each country were dispatched to work out the details, and in the end the separation was a bloodless one.

This is a favorite story of Tug's because it suggests that human relations, even difficult intercultural relationships with high stakes and acrimonious histories, can be transformed and improved through talk. If one considers for a moment the avenues by which Tug has sought to improve, sometimes to revolutionize, language-related education in this country, one realizes that in a broad sense his entire professional career is an enactment of faith in the power of talk. He has used the mouthpieces of his profession--teaching, giving presentations, organizing conferences, writing in journals and tradepapers--and he has done this with particular skill and commitment. But anyone who has observed Tug at work suspects that what is most distinctive about him is the way he has worked person to person, tirelessly looking for students, teachers, administrators, parents, or colleagues who were interested in languages, who shared some vision or conviction about promoting them, and whose work might productively reflect those convictions. The papers in this volume reveal in a wonderfully human way the fruit that these ideas and such relationships could bear.

The story of the Swedish-Norwegian separation illustrates too one particularly effective technique of Tug's in talking about the sorts of language education he could imagine. He often demonstrated what *might* be possible by finding and relating true examples of what others had

managed to achieve against the odds--feats of diplomacy, innovative school programs, stellar teachers, or exemplary bilingual families. In so doing he has fed our imaginations with his own, helping us to see beyond the tyranny of what seemed likely so that we could envision what we might possibly achieve. To emphasize only imagination, however, is to obscure something vitally important--akin to noticing the good looks and charm while ignoring the long straight spine. As the story of the four Norwegian leaders suggests, in human and societal affairs, a little miracle occurs not because people dream it, but because they have the courage to persist in communicating the vision.

Few people in this century have had such an impact on language education in the United States. Taken alone, Tug's roles in the instigation, implementation, and institutionalizing of foreign languages in the elementary schools and bilingual education are staggering. Even more staggering is the number of lives his work has touched--and continues to touch. At the 1994 NABE Conference session honoring him, friends,colleagues, and former students in attendance arose after the formal presentation to speak extemporaneously about the way that contact with him had reshaped in some way their sensibilities, their teaching, and most movingly, their raising of their own children. Yet for all the remarkable accomplishments, Tug notes that his work remains unfinished. He wrote in 1986, "Casting a retrospective glance over a long career, I wish I could start over, not from scratch, but from where I am now" (39). To the limited extent that he allows himself credit for any accomplishments, they remain a source of pride to him. But in his heart, as in his mind, the vision he holds of language teaching and learning in this country is one not yet fully realized.

References

The list below does not represent the complete work of Theodore Andersson. It does, however, contain items not mentioned in the paper or autobiographical sketch.

Andersson,T. (1934). Carlos María Ocantos, Argentine novelist. New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Press. Second printing, 1970.

Andersson,T. (1935). Carlos María Ocantos y su obra. Madrid: Compañía General Españía General Española de Libería.

Andersson,T. (1951). The Yale-Barnard Conference on the teaching of French: A summary and evaluation. The French Review, 26, 2, 121-128.

Andersson,T. (1953a). Preparation of foreign language teachers for the elementary school. Journal of Teacher Education, XXX.

Andersson,T. (1953b). The preparation of language teachers for the elementary school. Paper presented at the Conference on the Role of Foreign Languages in American Schools, Washington, D.C.

Andersson,T. (1953c). The teaching of foreign languages in the elementary school. Boston, Massachusetts: D.C. Heath & Co.Andersson,T. (1953d). The UNESCO Seminar on the teaching of modern languages. School and Society, 77, 1,408-410.Andersson,T. (1954a). Language teachers and international understanding. Modern Language Journal, 38, 2, 61-65.

Andersson,T. (1954b). The problem of supplying foreign-language teachers for the elementary school. Hispania, 37, 1, 65-68.

Andersson,T. (1955). Modern language teaching in primary schools. In T. Andersson & F. Walter, (eds.), The teaching of modern languages. Paris: UNESCO.

Andersson,T. (1957). Foreign languages and intercultural understanding. National Elementary School Principal, 36, 5, 1-3.

Andersson,T. (1959). Spanish, language of the Americas. Hispania, 62, 3, 347-350.

Andersson,T. (1960). The optimum age for beginning the study of modern languages." International Review of Education, 6, 3,298-306.

Andersson,T. (1962a). An FL blueprint in focus. Modern Language Journal, 46, 3, 116-117.

Andersson,T. (1962b). The teacher of modern languages. In E. Stabler (Ed.), The education of the secondary school teacher. Middletown, Connecticut: Wesleyan University Press, pp. 162-190.

Andersson,T. (1963a). Do we want certified teachers or qualified ones? Modern Language Journal, 47, 6, 231-235.

Andersson,T. (1963b). FLES: A clarification. National Elementary Principal, 43, 1, 61-62.

Andersson,T. (1964a). The faces of language: Tool-communication-culture-style. The Graduate Journal of the University of Texas, 6, 2, 304-321.

Andersson,T. (1964b). Foreign languages in the elementary school in the United States of America: Retrospect and new directions. In International Conference: Modern Foreign Language Teaching: Papers and Reports of Groups and Committees--Preprints, Part 2. Berlin: Paedagogische Arbeitsstelle und Sekr. Paedagogisches Zentrum.

Andersson,T. (1964c). From school to college in foreign languages. National Education Association Journal, 53, 35-36.

Andersson,T. (1965). A new focus on the bilingual child. Modern Language Journal, 49, 3, 156-160.

Andersson,T. (1967). The bilingual in the southwest. The Florida Foreign Language Reporter, 5, 2, 15.

Andersson,T. (1969a). Bilingual schooling: Oasis or mirage? Hispania, 52, 69-74.

Andersson,T. (1969b). Foreign languages in the elementary school: A struggle against mediocrity. Austin, Texas: University of Texas Press.

Andersson,T. (1971a). Bilingual education: The American experience. Modern Language Journal, 60, 427-440.

Andersson,T. (Winter, 1971). New directions in foreign language teaching. Improving College and University Teaching, 19, 1, 35-36.

Andersson,T. (1973a). Bilingual education and early childhood. Paper presented at the First Annual International Multilingual, Multicultural Conference, San Diego, California; Hispania, 57, 1, 27-34.

Andersson,T. (1973b). Unidad y diversidad en los estudios españoles y portugueses. Presidential address at the AATSP Conference, Mexico City; Hispania, 56, 4, 981-987.

Andersson,T. (1974b). The role of the teacher in a bilingual community. Hispania, 57, 4, 927-932.

Andersson,T. (1975). The bilingual child's "right to read." Journal of the Linguistic Association of the Southwest, 1, 2, 35-41.

Andersson,T. (1976a). Popular and elite bilingualism reconciled. Hispania, 59, 3, 497-498.

Andersson,T. (1976b). A preschool biliteracy project. Georgetown University Papers on Languages and Linguistics, No. 12, 1-7.

Andersson,T. (1977a). Preschool biliteracy. Hispania, 60, 3, 527-530.

Andersson,T. (1977b). Research--Preschool Reading. Paper presented at the First Annual Conference of the Bilingual Education Student Organization, The University of Texas, Austin, Texas.

Andersson,T. (1977c). What lessons does bilingual education hold for foreign language teacher trainers? The Modern Language Journal, 61, 4, 159-160.

Andersson,T. (1978). Toward a theory of preschool biliteracy. In J. Alatis (Ed.), International dimensions of bilingual education. Georgetown: Georgetown University Press.

Andersson,T. (1979). Preschool biliteracy: Educational implications. Paper presented at the Fourteenth Educational Seminar, SEAMCO Regional Language Centre, Singapore.

Andersson,T. (1980). Parents wake up! Why deprive your child of a superior education? Hispania, 63, 2, 391-394.

Andersson,T. (1981a). A guide to family reading in two languages: The preschool years. Rosslyn, Virginia: National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education.

Andersson,T. (1981b). Preparing minority-group children for school. Paper presented at the 6th AILA World Congress, Lund, Sweden.

Andersson,T. (1985). A centennial perspective. ADFL Bulletin, 16, 2, 1-4.

Andersson,T. (1987). The preschool acquisition of literacy in one or more languages. In B. Narr & H. Wittje, (Eds.), Sprachewerb und mehrsprachingkeit/language acquisition and multilingualism: Festschrift für Els Oksaar zum 60 geburtstag (pp. 39-51). Tübingen:Gunter Narr Verlag.

Andersson,T., & Bergin, T.G. (1941). French plays. New York: American Book Company.

Andersson,T., & Boyer, M.V. (1970). Bilingual schooling in the United States. Austin, Texas: Southwest Educational Development Laboratory; Washington, D.C.: USGPO; Second edition, revised, Austin: National Educational Laboratory.

Andersson, T., & Boyer, M.V., and Basset, R.W. (1960). Foggy Bottom Conference report. Research Study Conference on Problems of State-Level Supervision of Instruction in Modern Foreign Languages, George Washington University, Washington, D.C.

Andersson,T., Mackey, W.F., (Eds.) (1977). Bilingualism in early childhood. Rowley, Massachusetts: Newbury House Publishers.

Andersson,T., & Walter, F. (1955). The teaching of modern languages. Paris: UNESCO.

Bagster-Collins, E.W. (1930). History of modern language teaching in the United States. In Studies in modern language teaching: Reports prepared for the modern foreign language study and the Canadian Committee on Modern Languages. Publications of the American and Canadian Committees on Modern Languages, Vol. 27, New York: The MacMillan Company, 1930.

Bloom, B.S. (1964). Stability and change in human characteristics. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.Cartter, A.M. (1966). An assessment of quality in graduate education. Washington, D.C., American Council on Education.

Christian, C. (1976). Social and psychological implications of bilingual literacy. In A. Simoes, (Ed.), The bilingual child: Research and analysis of existing educational themes. New York: Academic Press, 17-40.

Christian, C. (1977). Minority language skills before age three. In W.F. Mackey and T. Andersson, (Eds.), Bilingualism in early childhood. Rowley, Massachusetts: Newbury House Publishers, pp. 94-108.

Collier, V.P., & Thomas, W.P. (1989). How long? A synthesis of research on academic achievement in a second language. TESOL Quarterly, 23, 509-531.

Condon, W.S. (1974). Neonate movement is synchronized with adult speech: Interactional participation and language acquisition. Science, 183, 99-101.

Delgado-Gaitán, C. (1992). School matters in the Mexican American home: Socializing children to education. American Educational Research Journal, 29, 3, 495-513.

Doman, Glenn (1964). How to teach your baby to read: The gentle revolution. New York: Random House.

Fishman, J. (1966). Language loyalty in the United States. The Hague: Mouton.

Gardner, R.C., & Lambert, W.E. (1972). Attitudes and motivation in second language learning. Rowley Massachusetts: Newbury House.

Gouin, F. (1912). The art of teaching and studying languages. London: George Philip and Son.

Hall, E. (1961). The silent language. A Premier Book. Greenwich, Connecticut: Fawcett Publications.

Krashen, S.D. (1981). Second language acquisition and second language learning. London: Pergamon Press.

Lambert, W.E. & Tucker, G.R. (1972). Bilingual education of children: The St. Lambert experiment. Rowley, Massachusetts.

Lee, O.R. (1977). Early bilingual reading as an aid to bilingual and bicultural adjustment for a second generation Korean child. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation. Georgetown University.

Modern Language Association. (1955a). The MLA Foreign Language Program. Modern Language Journal, 39, 2, 96-99.

Modern Language Association. (1955b). The MLA Foreign Language Program. Modern Language Journal, 39, 4, 96-99.

Modern Language Association. (1956). Recent policy statements, MLA FL Steering Committee. Modern Language Journal, 40, 7, 409-415.

Moll, L.C., (Ed.). (1990). Vygotsky and education: Instructional implications and applications of sociohistorical psychology. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Moll, L.C. & Greenberg, J.B. (1990). Creating zones of possibilities. In Moll, L. (Ed.), Vygotsky and education: Instructional implications and applications of sociohistorical psychology, pp. 319-348. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Montessori, M. (1959). Education for a new world. Third impression. Adyar, Madras: India: Kalakshetra Publications.

Parker, W.R. (1955). The MLA Foreign Language Program. Modern Language Journal, 39, 3, 96-99.

Past, A. (1976). Preschool reading in two languages as a factor in bilingualism. Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation. University of Texas at Austin.

Past, K. (1975). Reading in two languages from age two: A case study. Unpublished M.A. thesis.

Salling, A. (1952). Det lille sprog. En Sprogundervisningens teori. Copenhagen: Grafisk Forlag.

Scott, F.D. (1977). Sweden: The nation's history. Minneapolis, Minnesota: Minnesota University Press.

Söderbergh, R. (1971). Reading in early childhood. Stockholm: Almqvist and Wiksell; Georgetown: Georgetown University Press, 1977.

Söderbergh, R. (1977). First language acquisition of Swedish. In W.F. Mackey and T. Andersson, (Eds.), Bilingualism in early childhood. Rowley, Massachusetts: Newbury House Publishers, pp. 66-93.

Stabler, Ernest, (Ed.). (1962). The education of the secondary school teacher. Middletown, Connecticut: Wesleyan University Press.

Starr, W. H. (1955). Foreign language teaching and intercultural understanding. School and Society, 81, 2055, 81-84.

Trevarthen, C. (1977). Descriptive analyses of infant communicative behavior. In H.R. Schaffer, (Ed.), Studies in Mother-Infant Interaction. London: Academic Press, 227-270.

Warren, B. (Ed.), (1970, September 20). Books. The American- Statesman, p. T31,35.

ENDNOTES

1.The nickname was acquired in high school. A pitcher on the baseball team looked at Tug one day at practice and exclaimed, "You look like Elmer Tuggles!" Elmer Tuggles was a contemporary cartoon strip character. For awhile he was dubbed "Tuggles," which was gradually shortened to "Tug."

2.This was the first of two Yale-Barnard Conferences. Tug organized the first, raising funds by writing college and university language departments in the region and asking them to contribute $25. André Mesnard of Barnard organized the second in 1953. Tug notes in this article that these conferences followed a series of three similar annual Barnard Conferences. What he could not have known at the time was that the Yale-Barnard Conferences would in 1954 become the Northeast Conference on the Teaching of Languages, still a well-known institution.

3.This is particularly remarkable when one realizes that a serious leg injury sustained in a car accident in the summer of 1952 left him essentially bed-ridden for a year. He made the UNESCO trip in August, 1953 to Ceylon on crutches. I have just called him in Austin to ask how he could have managed to do so much under the circumstances. "Well," he said, "I guess one talks with one's tongue."

4.The use of what we now consider sexist language reflects the conventions of the time, of course. In fact, Tug was a feminist of the first order long, before this writing, actively favoring equalization of pay for women professors in the 1940's.

5.Tug was a friend and admirer of Starr's. In early 1952, Tug was recruited for a brief French-speaking diplomatic mission as Educational Advisor in Vietnam for the Mutual Security Agency. Communication between the U.S. chargé'd'affaires there and the Washington offices had completely broken down, and the Vietnamese were obviously displeased with the U.S. diplomat. Tug's job was to go to the relevant sites in Vietnam, assess the situation, and make a recommendation. Following a period of extensive briefing at the State Department he did so, (forgetting to pick up his passport before leaving and traveling around the world without). After getting a picture of the situation, he wired home that the chargé'd'affaires should be replaced, enumerating the qualifications the new person should have. Returning to Washington for debriefing, the state department staffer who met him at the airport teased Tug about the list of necessary qualifications. "So, all we need is the Angel Gabriel!" The job was offered to Tug, who turned it down. But asked to make another recommendation, Tug called Wilmarth H. Starr, who after an evening's hesitation, took the job and embarked on a long career in that service.

6.The MLA later requested and received an additional grant from the Rockefeller Foundation to be spent from 1955-1958. At that point the Foreign Language Program would, in the words of William Riley Parker, "continue indefinitely as a regular project of the MLA" (Modern Language Association, 1955a:96).

7.The Conference was sponsored by the U.S. Office of Education. Tug notes in the August, 1960 Conference Report that, just two years earlier, immediately before the passage of the National Defense Education Act, only two States, New York and Georgia, had supervisors of foreign languages in their departments of education. New York had had at least one such supervisor since 1915, and currently had six. Georgia appointed its first in July 1958. The District of Columbia, by the way, had had a supervisor or similar position since 1918. At the time of the Conference, 37 States had appointed a supervisor, though in some cases the responsibility for foreign languages was merely added to the job of supervising mathematics or science. In a few cases, a university professor had been hired on a part-time basis. By comparison, 44 States had supervisors in both science and mathematics.

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Carol A. Evans teaches in the Departments of Teaching and Teacher Education and Language Reading and Culture at the University of Arizona in the College of Education. She has responsibility for administering the undergraduate bilingual program, and teaches courses on language and culture in the educational process. After five years as an elementary school bilingual teacher, Dr. Evans took her Ph.D. from the University of Texas at Austin in 1989. She then taught at the University of Texas at San Antonio for two years before moving to Arizona. Her scholarly interests run along two major tracks: the development of early literacy, and the issue of language in the dynamics of family life and individual identity, especially among Spanish-speaking families in the American Southwest.